THE Mennonite Quarterly Review

Board of Editors
Harold S. Bender, *Goshen College*, Editor

Guy F. Hershberger, *Goshen College*
Edward Yoder, *Scottdale, Pa.*
C. Henry Smith, *Bluffton, Ohio*
Christian Neff, *Weierhof, Germany*
John Umble, *Goshen College*
Ernst Correll, *Washington, D. C.*
Abram Warkentin, *Newton, Kansas*
Benjamin Unruh, *Karlsruhe, Germany*
John C. Wenger, *Goshen College*

VOLUME XIII APRIL, 1939 NUMBER TWO

CONTENTS

Editorial 74

Nonresistance and Litigation 75
Paul Erb

Church and State in Mennonite History 83
Harold S. Bender

The Obligation of the Christian to the State and Community — "Render to Caesar" 104
Edward Yoder

The Menace of Propaganda and How to Meet It 123
Melvin Gingerich

Nonresistance and Industrial Conflict 135
Guy F. Hershberger

EDITORIAL

THIS NUMBER OF THE REVIEW IS A SPECIAL NUMBER DEVOTED TO A SERIES OF PAPERS read at the "Mennonite Conference on Applied Non-Resistance" held at Goshen College on April 22, 1939. This conference was sponsored by the Peace Problems Committee of the Mennonite General Conference and was intended to furnish opportunity, through the reading of prepared papers and discussion in intimate groups, for serious consideration of problems which face the Christian of today who desires to apply to the whole of life sincerely and consistently the fundamental principles of peace and non-resistance as taught by Christ and the apostles. A similar conference held at Goshen College in February, 1935, dealt with the direct application of the principle of nonresistance to war and military service. The recent conference treated themes of a non-military character and was more related to practical everyday living. Since the papers printed in this number of the REVIEW were prepared for reading at the various sessions of this conference, they reflect the more intimate atmosphere of an informal discussion meeting, and are not meant to be exhaustive and carefully documented research articles.

SINCE THE "CONFERENCE ON APPLIED NON-RESISTANCE" WAS A MENNONITE CONFERence sponsored by an official organization of the Mennonite Church, it naturally presents discussions which reflect the historical and traditional thought of Mennonites on the themes of the discussion. From the very beginning of its history the Mennonite Church has tried to apply the principle of non-resistance to all types of social relationships. For instance, historically the Mennonite Church has maintained the principle that Christians should not participate in litigation for the purpose of attaining personal or group "rights." The main body of Mennonites in America has maintained this position unwaveringly to the present time. The same is true of the application of non-resistance to industrial conflict. It has always seemed to Mennonites that industrial conflict between employers and employees, in fact class conflict of any sort, is just as reprehensible to the spirit and way of life taught by the Prince of Peace as is military conflict, even though it may not lead so immediately or so inevitably to physical violence and destruction of life. Since industrial conflict in modern times finds expression in the conflict of organized groups of laborers and employers, and since this conflict in our time centers around the activities of industrial unionism to a large extent, the Mennonite church has forbidden its members to join labor unions or to take part in the activities of such organizations. The papers by Professor Erb and Professor Hershberger on these two subjects, litigation and industrial conflict, reflect the position of the Mennonite Church and seek to ground this position in the teaching of the Scriptures as well as to show how these principles can be effectively and consistently applied to our modern life.

THE TWO PAPERS DEALING WITH THE SUBJECT OF CHURCH AND STATE, THE ONE BY Professor Bender on Church and State in Mennonite History and the other by Dr. Edward Yoder on the obligation of the Christian to the state and the community, deal with the theme which has probably caused more tribulation for the Mennonite Church in its 400 years of history than any other one theme. It is a theme which is highly significant in our time as the totalitarian state extends the claims of its sovereignty over increasingly large population groups in the modern world. The question of church and state is today a burning issue in Europe, and one which is forcing the Christian Church to rethink its whole attitude toward the social order in general as well as toward its political forms. Perhaps the historic position of the Mennonite Church on the fundamental relation of church and state may have some contribution to make to the solution of this great problem of Christian living. The paper by Professor Gingerich on "The Menace of Propaganda and How to Meet It," presents in a vivid way the dangers that threaten the Christian as he attempts to maintain goodwill and justice in his attitudes toward all. We live in an age of propaganda and we must expect that propaganda will have increasingly wide application and increasingly effective methods. The power of propaganda in preparing for conflict and violence in social strife as well as in international relations is so obvious that the Christian must be prepared to meet it with all the resources at his command lest he be swept away into the paganisms of hate, selfishness, and fear that threaten to engulf our very civilization.

THE
Mennonite Quarterly
Review

VOLUME XIII APRIL, 1939 NUMBER 2

NONRESISTANCE AND LITIGATION

PAUL ERB

The Christian attitude which we call nonresistance is a matter of the whole life. It is not a political theory of nonsupport of the government in military projects. It is not an idealistic social philosophy which envisions things as they should be and devotes itself to bringing them into reality. It is a way of living based upon the teaching of Scripture and the dictates of a heart filled with the love of God. It is the integration of the whole personality and the whole way of living around a cardinal principle of the godly life. It requires that a man take the same attitude toward hostile ones in the close circle of friends and neighbors that he professes to take toward the enemy across the national border. The whole testimony of the life to a principle of peace is vitiated by any inconsistency in applying this principle to the details of the daily life. There was once a young lady who was majoring in sociology and preparing for social service. But she couldn't get along with her neighbors. And there may well have been a man who professed to be opposed to war but who rubbed people sore at every turn he made. Such nonresistance counts for little. If I am nonresistant at all, I must be nonresistant in all.

The New Testament teaches us that the Lord is a God of love. When His Spirit dwells in us and has free sway, He impels us to thoughts and deeds of love. The Christian life is more than one way of human living. It is the way of divine living—of God finding expression here and now in human life. Those who know us should realize that we have been with Jesus and learned of Him. When my relations with others betray in any way an attitude that is not in accord with the Spirit of God, then the testimony of my life is against Christianity rather than for it.

The first important question to raise in regard to litigation as it relates to the nonresistant life is this: to what sort of a spirit and personal attitude does the ordinary suit at law witness? Laws have been made for the purpose of protecting life, property, and personal well-being. In so far as this is their purpose and in so far as they serve this end, our legal codes are not to be condemned as evil. But it is well known that legal processes are very often used to further personal ends at the expense of justice. It has become almost a thing to be taken for granted that if one person can secure an advantage over another through a law suit he will do so. The question is not what is just, but what can I get out of him. Even though it be granted that our courts are upright, all sorts of injustices are possible when one has enough money to back a smart lawyer.

In a western state two Mennonites were engaged in a law suit. When the judge rendered the decision, he began by saying, "You are Mennonites and have no business in this court. This is not your way of settling disputes." This judge recognized what is true, that from the beginning of our history it has been against Mennonite principles to carry our quarrels to courts of law. As brethren, we should be able to settle our disputes between ourselves or at least through adjudicators chosen from the church. Upon what Scriptural basis may this tradition of our people rest?

The great Scripture passage on this subject is in the sixth chapter of I Corinthians. This passage is rendered as follows in the authorized version:

"Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain

to this life? If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the church. I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" This passage now requires our attention. Paul's first question, dare any of you go to law before the unjust, implies that such action is contrary to the genius and spirit of the Christian religion and tends to expose that religion to the contempt of the world. In the phrase of Bengel, "The insulted majesty of Christians is denoted by a grand word, dare." It seems unthinkable to Paul that there should be found in the Christian Church such an inconsistent thing as Christians carrying their disputes to non-Christian judges. The unjust, to whom he says these disputes should not be taken, are, of course, the unbelieving pagans as distinguished from the believers in Christ. There is no necessary charge here that all civil judges are devoted to injustice, but there is a contrast placed between those who are believers and those who are not. The unjust are contrasted with the saints. If it be supposed that Paul's argument would not obtain in a Christian country where the judges are often men of high character and even of Christian faith, we need but be reminded that, after all, in the law court it is civil law and not Biblical principles which obtain. Shylock's bond gave him a right to the pound of flesh and the court had to recognize that right, unchristian as it was. Even though we live in a nominally Christian country, yet our system of jurisprudence is derived, not from the New Testament, but from the codes of Roman law. Our courts today may be thought of as the lineal descendants of the civil courts of Paul's day. At least the differences are not significant enough to invalidate the argument of this passage.

Paul does not blame the Corinthians for having matters that need adjudication. It is to be expected that there will arise some matters of disagreement wherever people live in relation. It is the method of settling these disagreements that brings the barb of Paul's condemnation. These matters should be brought to the judg-

ment of saints, not of the unbelieving. There may often arise questions in which there is an earnest desire on the part of both sides to have justice done. It may be, however, an honest question as to what justice is. The spirit of such a search for the right is altogether different from the litigious spirit which tries to secure for one's self everything possible in the way of finances or personal advantage. If I am filled with the right sort of Christian love, I will be utterly unwilling that any dispute should be settled in my favor when by right it should have gone the other way. It is wrong to steal even if a court approves the theft.

Paul now proceeds in his argument by an appeal to the fact commonly accepted by all, according to his language, that the saints shall judge the world. Whatever is to be the exact nature of this judgment, it is in accord with other teachings of the New Testament that we shall exercise with Christ judgment upon men and angels. The faithful servant, we are told, will be set over ten cities or five as his ability may be. Somehow, in the future economy of God's kingdom, it shall be the function of saints to judge and to manage. Now, says Paul, if in the world to come, in matters of spiritual and eternal interest, the saints are to act as judges, how can it be possible that there cannot be found in the Church men who can judge such small matters as the location of line fences and the reduction of long-standing debts. Shall not we, who will judge angels, much more be able to judge the things that belong to our petty affairs of yesterday, today, and tomorrow? As so often in his writings, Paul ties conduct to doctrine and, in this great teaching of the judging function of saints in the next world, he finds an amazing background for his contention that the Church should find in her own membership wisdom and ability to settle her own disputes.

The interpretation of verse four turns upon whether the word 'set' is to be taken as an imperative as it is in the authorized version, or as an indicative, used in a question, as the revised version renders it. The arguments of the expositors seem to be pretty well balanced between the two renderings. If the authorized version is right, then Paul is saying, whenever disputes concerning this life arise, pick out the least able and the least esteemed in the church as judges rather than to continue as you are, carrying your disputes to the law courts. If the revised version is right, then the passage

would say, shall we secure judgments concerning things pertaining to this life from those who are least esteemed by the church, that is, from the unbelievers? Whichever interpretation is accepted, the argument all reads the same way. Can it be possible, Paul goes on, that in the Corinthian Church, so proud of its wisdom, so learned and able, that there is not a wise man who can judge between his brethren? The Corinthian Church, no doubt, would have resented such an implication, but when they took their disputes to the courts, they were in effect saying there was nobody in the church able to settle these affairs. And so the church and, more to be regretted, the world, beheld the shameful spectacle of brother suing brother in the law courts of the pagan unbelievers of Corinth. Nothing good can be said of such a practice. It is absolutely a fault. The word 'fault' here implies the meaning of loss, defeat, damage. There is loss of Christian testimony, loss of spiritual power, defeat of the very cause of love which they are striving to build up. The church is brought into disrepute. Her chief tenets are denied in the language which the world can best understand, the language of our actions. Rather than the Church should suffer such loss, it would be much better to accept personal loss, to take wrong, to allow ourselves to be defrauded. There are things which might be ours by right, but we can well afford to lose them if, by our loss, the cause of the kingdom is forwarded. When people see that we are willing to suffer the loss of property for the sake of our religious principles, they will be inclined to take seriously our profession of a gospel of love. Is it not true that the unChristlike attitude of Christian people in these matters, as well as in others, is the chief enemy of the Church today? We are being defeated, not from without the camp, but from within. There are traitors among us who make our faith and our profession a laughing stock with the world. Even as among the Corinthians, there are some who not only will not allow themselves to be defrauded but who actually do wrong and defraud, and that their own brethren. This principle that we ought to yield to, rather than resist the evil actions of men against us, was stated by our Lord when He said, in Matt. 5:40: "And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also." And, certainly, one of the outstanding expressions of a Christian spirit is this willingness to see others profit at our expense. To have a reputation for yieldingness is a high level of Christian living.

So much for the exposition of the text. And, for the believing Christian, there is not much to be said when the Bible has spoken. Simply an application of the principles to the circumstances in which we find ourselves. Certainly the use of law courts to gain advantage over a brother in the Church is absolutely and utterly condemned by this passage. But there may be other situations. Sometimes it is not a matter of getting advantage, but rather of finding out what justice is and settling things so they will stay settled in our own generation and the next. There might be, I think, such things as amicable suits in which both parties, with the kindest of feelings one toward the other, seek to clear up some matter that has legal entanglements. Land titles, sometimes, cannot be cleared up except by such a means. There is always danger, of course, that such amicable suits will stir up selfish feelings and resentments. When this happens they go beyond the pale of Christian thought and conduct. But the following incident, taken from the Sunshine Magazine, would seem to be probable enough for men of a real Christian spirit:

Somewhere in the upper reaches of the great Alpine tract there lies a fertile valley, occupied by the remnant of the Mennonites who early settled here. These people are nonresistant, law-abiding, and peace-loving. At the passing of the period of bitter persecution, this little group found there a place of refuge and repose, and established laws for their protection.

They were farmers, tillers of the soil, and lived in the spirit of brotherly love. They were as a family of brothers living together, each mindful not only of his own interests but equally of the interests of others.

One day a misunderstanding arose between two neighbors concerning their boundary line. They discussed the matter and tried in every way to come to a proper understanding. But they failed to agree, and rather than allow any ill-feeling among themselves, they decided to refer to the court and abide by its decision.

The day for the trial arrived and the farmer who lived farthest away, called David, came by where he found John, the other, hilling his potatoes.

"Come, John," said David, "let us go to the court."

"These potatoes will suffer if they are not hilled today," replied John; "You go to the court and tell the story. You know all about our differences and can tell them as well as I. First put your side

before the court, and then mine. Stop on your way home and tell me the verdict."

So David went on alone, down the mountain side into the valley where the court held forth.

That evening at dusk David came plodding back up the mountain path. "Well, brother," he said, as John came to meet him halfway, "I went to court and put both sides before them, and the court decided in your favor."

And David continued on his way humming a little folk melody. —Mary Graybill. If legal necessity requires that we go to court concerning any matter, let us go in such a spirit of utter mutual trust.

Then there is the situation of our dealing with people who are not motivated by the same Christian spirit as we are. It might be argued that they cannot understand our language. We must talk to them in the vocabulary they do understand, in words that bristle with the authority of law. If people know that we will not sue for collections, won't they refuse to pay? Is it possible to live in a selfish, grasping world without playing also a selfish, grasping part? I cannot speak out of wide experience here, but I have observed that the ill will engendered by forced collections makes such a method of very doubtful value in maintaining friendships or in holding business. I know successful business firms, and big ones too, who have a stated policy that they will not sue. Some of the recent books on strategy in handling people point out that friendly tact is far more effective than the mailed fist.

Still another situation may arise when one is unwillingly made the defendant in a suit. There may be situations in which there is nothing to do but to appear to defend your case, but certainly 99 cases out of 100 could be settled better out of court. And usually they will be settled out of court if even one party in the suit takes a gentle and yielding attitude. It takes two to fight and if I will not fight in court, but insist on sitting down and talking things through to a settlement, all the opprobrium and scandal to the Church is done away with and probably a great deal of money is saved.

The Christian then should stay out of the law courts because the usual spirit of the place is foreign to the loving fellowship of Christian brotherhood. Our differences, whatever they may be, can best be settled by ourselves or by those among our brethren who can take into consideration all the Christian implications in the situation. A

law court must act on the cold basis of statute law. And because of the usual character of litigious action, when the world sees the church member engaged in a law suit, he may well assume that the so-called Christian is doing the unChristlike thing by trying to get out of his brother something to add to his own store. Such things ought not to be. They cannot be when we love one another with true hearts fervently.

CHURCH AND STATE IN MENNONITE HISTORY

HAROLD S. BENDER

Of all the forms of social organization which man has devised and established for the promotion of his well being, none has been more universal, more comprehensive and more powerful than the state. However, there is nothing mystical nor mysterious about the nature of the state, for after all the state is only the totality of the inhabitants of a given area organized to promote the common welfare through political measures and means. The form of the state has varied much in the course of recorded history. Most commonly it has taken the form of the control of the mass by a small fraction of the population, usually composed of those who have in some way or other been able to secure the instruments of power in the form of weapons, wealth or wisdom. In rare instances in the past the control of the political organization of a people has actually been in the hands of the people themselves through some form of democratic control such as that used in the city states of ancient Greece, in the Swiss mountain cantons of medieval times, or in the town meetings of Puritan New England. In the last three hundred years, particularly among the Anglo-Saxon peoples, the democratic form of government has been developed to its highest degree. However, even in this modern twentieth century four-fifths of the world population still lives under a form of state organization, which, regardless of its nominal form, is in fact nothing less than dictatorial, that is the rule over the masses by the few who possess the instruments of power. Dictatorships are not new; most of the world's population has always lived under dictatorial regimes.

The Christian church was planted in a world of dictatorial states. Until recent times it has lived in a world of dictatorial states, and it has lived successfully. It is an error to assume that Christianity can exist only under the democratic form of state organization, or that democracy is essential to the life of the Christian church. So far as I can understand the Scripture there is no Divinely established form of the state, and nothing in the Old or New Testament can be taken for or against any particular form of the state.

Far more important for the Christian church than the form of the state, has been the function of the state. Where the state has confined its function to the minimum of maintaining law and order, there has been little or no occasion for conflict between church and state, at least where the exercise of this function of government has required the services of only a few of the male members of the population. The proper relation of the church to the state in the exercise of this function is described by Paul in Romans 13 as one of subjection. "For he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject . . . . For this cause pay ye tribute also . . . . Render therefore to all that is due, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor." This subjection apparently involves chiefly obedience to the law and order of the state and the payment of taxes imposed by the state, together with general reverence and respect to the representative organs of the state. Peter also says in I Peter 2, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or to governors as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers or for the praise of them that do well . . . . Honor the king."

There have been states, however, which have extended their functions far beyond the primary function of the maintenance of law and order and the collection of taxes to support the same. In fact today every state worthy of the name professes to provide for its citizens a large variety of economic benefits which are taken as a matter of course by most of us. Seldom need there be any occasion for conflicts between the church and state in these performances. However, when the state as such enters those fields which relate to the real values of life, such as morals, religion, family life and relationships, art and music, education, press and radio and other forms of expression, it extends its functions into fields which are also in part at least a concern of the church. In doing so the state must of necessity give expression to fundamental concepts of value, to a philosophy of life and a way of living which include judgments as to the ultimate goals of living and the destiny of man. It is in this area of the state's functioning that the church has chiefly come into conflict with the state. The Mennonite church has like other churches not been able to escape this conflict, for the Mennonite church

also has ideals as to the goals and destiny of man and the things which are worth while living for according to the teachings of the Holy Scriptures and the example of Christ.

When the state goes so far as to extend its function to include all phases of life, and exercises an exclusive and authoritative control over all forms of expression of the human spirit and all types of social relationship, and does this in conformity with an all-inclusive and final philosophy of life, this conflict with the church is inevitable, for the church also claims for God final authority. The type of state just described is known in our modern vocabulary as "totalitarian". However, totalitarianism is not the creation of Adolf Hitler or Benito Mussolini or Stalin. There were totalitarian states before communism and fascism were established in our western world. In fact totalitarianism has been one of the most common types of state functioning in human history. The Roman Empire was a totalitarian state, in the days when the church was born. However, the totalitarianism of these earlier states was not so rigid nor so effective, nor perhaps so comprehensive as that of modern Germany and Russia and Italy.

Now the danger of conflict between the church and state, even in totalitarianism, arises only when the philosophy of life that governs the rulers of the state is in conflict with the faith of the Christian Church. In the Roman Empire to 380 this was the case. But throughout western Europe from the year 380 A. D. to the Reformation, that is for over 1200 years, this was not true. In fact the opposite was the case. Our medieval forefathers lived in a world in which the ethics and social ideals as well as the religious faith and practices of the Christian church were not only accepted by the rulers of the state but were made the very basis of the whole functioning of the state. The totalitarianism of the medieval states was a Christian totalitarianism. It was a successful amalgamation of church and state, with the church and its way of life dominant. The whole body of medieval society was conceived of as a Corpus Christianum, a Christian body politic, in which there was no division in reality between the church and state even though there were rivalries and conflicts between the organs of the church and the organs of the state. Such a time has never been experienced by man either before or since. It must have been a most interesting time in which

to live, at least for those who accepted the way of life which was maintained by the church in that time.

The great upheaval of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation from 1517 to 1648, which affected primarily only the Teutonic peoples of the west, broke once and for all this ideal unity for church and state, and set in motion the forces which have operated increasingly to divorce the functions of the state from the functions of the church, to split the life of man between the two sovereignties, and to secularize the life of our western world so that today the church has been relegated to a position of mere moral influence in most western European countries, particularly in the United States. It no longer has any direct means of forcing the state to promote its ideals and its philosophy. At the same time those ruling classes which have dominated the states of western Europe have become increasingly liberated, if one may use such a term, from the Christian philosophy of life and the Christian ethic, so that today there are exceedingly few rulers of state who profess to support the Christian way of life or to make it sovereign in their activities or in the functions of the state which they control. In fact the trend seems to be ever more in the direction of departure from and antagonism to Christian principles. Thus the greatest totalitarian state, Russia, is in the hands of rulers whose conduct and profession has become sharply anti-Christian and is definitely oriented toward the destruction of the Christian church and the way of life which it has promoted throughout these two thousand years. Trends in certain other totalitarian states give rise to grave concern among the Christians of these states.

However, when the Mennonite church was founded in Switzerland and Holland, this was not yet the case. Rather, the medieval concept that state and church should be united and that the state should promote a way of life following the principles upheld by the church, was maintained by the reformers in every country where Protestantism was established. There was however a subtle but very significant change in the relationship of church and state which should be noted. In the Catholic Corpus Christianum of the middle ages the church was dominant, in the Protestant Churches of the Reformation period and after, all too often the state was dominant. The Catholic system required the state to be Christian and promote Christianity. Luther, however, for instance, felt that the state was

evil, and all that the church had to ask of the state was that the state should protect the church and permit it free functioning, in return for which the church would support law and order and the social organization of the status quo. Luther had no interest at all in having the church dominate the state and make the state Christian. He felt that this was impossible. It is clear then that in this respect the Protestant Reformation represented a distinct retreat from the church and state system of the middle ages.

Mennonites, whether they lived in Switzerland, Germany, Holland, or France, lived in a world where the state as one of its functions required the conformity of all citizens to the established form of religion supported by the state, and treated those who did not conform as criminals. It was not until 1815 that full toleration and recognition of the Mennonite faith in Switzerland was achieved. In Holland a measure of toleration was achieved as early as 1581, but here likewise full toleration did not come until quite late, in 1795. It was somewhat different in the small states of south Germany such as the Palatinate and Baden, Alsace, Württemberg, and Bavaria, where Mennonites frequently were sought after by the princes because of their skill in agriculture, and where they had received a limited toleration as early as the late seventeenth century. The same was true of the Mennonites who settled in Russia at the invitation of Empress Catherine after 1788.

In the light of these facts, it is clear that for the most part the Mennonites of Europe were bound to be in conflict with the states under which they lived from 1525 until the nineteenth century. The intensity of this conflict depended upon two factors, first, the steadfastness of the Mennonites in maintaining their faith and ethics, and second, the degree of the repression which the state imposed upon the Mennonites. We of today often fail to appreciate the breadth and the intensity of this conflict for our forefathers. In a general way we know about it, and we do appreciate the suffering which our martyr ancestors endured, yet it is hardly possible for us who live in a land of peace and liberty where the state has since its organization in 1789 definitely excluded from its functions any interference with or control of the religious life of its citizens, to appreciate in reality the real bitterness and intensity of the conflict which was imposed upon our forefathers for three hundred years or more. As late as 1811 for instance, twenty-seven unbaptized chil-

dren of Mennonites living in the Canton of Berne, Switzerland, were actually forcibly baptized in the state church.

The conflict between the Mennonite church and the state was not exclusively nor primarily a conflict over such questions as military service or the oath. Universal compulsory military service was unknown in earlier times except in some of the Swiss cantons such as the Canton of Berne in the eighteenth century where militia service was required. It was Napoleon who first introduced universal conscription, and it was modern Prussia which led the western world in the establishment of a uniform compulsory military service program for all citizens in peace times as well as in war time. For our forefathers the conflict with the state was primarily over such principles as the right to worship according to one's own conscience, the right to baptize and to marry and to bury in the faith, the right to build church houses and to own property, to enter freely into trades and crafts of various kinds, even the elementary right to exist as inhabitants of an area. Under these circumstances Mennonites could *honor* the king, but could not be subject to "the powers that be" in any except the most limited sense of obeying the regulations governing law and order, for to have been subject to the state would have been to surrender everything that they held dear. It is small wonder then that the history of the Mennonites of Europe for the first three hundred years was so often one of persecution and of migration and flight from one city to the other, and from one country to the other. They were often in a literal sense pilgrims and wanderers upon the face of the earth, with no abiding cities and with no abiding homeland, except the homeland of the soul, no citizenship except the citizenship of heaven.

As the spirit of toleration, however, gradually descended upon Europe, first in Holland, then in Switzerland, and finally in Germany, the situation changed. Gradually the major conflict between the Mennonites and the state came to an end. Gradually Mennonites came to enjoy all the rights of other human beings. They could worship according to their conscience, they could establish their social organization and maintain a way of life that seemed good to them. They could own property, they could move about freely, they could enjoy the protection of the state.

They were even admitted to participation in the state. And here is where an altogether new situation was created for the Mennon-

ites. The problem of participation in the state had never arisen before, because such participation was not only not desired by the Mennonites, but was not even possible. It is true that theoretically the founders of the Mennonite Church such as Conrad Grebel and Pilgram Marpeck in Switzerland and South Germany, or Menno Simons and Dietrich Philips in Holland, taught that the Christian should not take part in government and should not become a magistrate, yet this was purely a theoretical conclusion because in those days no Mennonite could have become a magistrate even if he had wanted to do so. No Mennonite could have held political office because he was not a full citizen of the state, and no Mennonite could have voted because he was a heretic. Furthermore most of the Mennonites of Europe were of the lower classes, both as to social standing and as to wealth, so that they no more aspired to participate in governmental affairs than any other peasants or poor people of the state in which they lived. At most places only the wealthy, property-owning upper classes were permitted to participate in the life of the state, even though the remaining population may have belonged to the state church. The problem of participation in the state therefore arose first in those places where Mennonites became wealthy and cultured.

Let us consider now the record of the Mennonites of Europe as it concerns participation in the functioning of the state. The first state which granted to Mennonites full right of participation in the life of the state was Holland. A decree to this effect was issued in 1795. It was not long until the Mennonites, who already in many cases were wealthy and educated, took advantage of this opportunity and gradually came to occupy not only a modest place in the life of the Netherlands, but ultimately a superior place. In fact the Mennonites of Holland today occupy a place of influence far out of proportion to their numbers in the political, cultural and economic life of their country. Mennonites of Holland have held the highest political posts in the nation. A deacon of the Mennonite church at the Hague was minister in the navy. During the World War a Mennonite was burgomaster of Amsterdam. Mennonites have occupied the highest seats on the judicial bench in Holland, they have filled the post of governor of the Netherlands East Indies, they have served on city councils and in minor official posts without number. Most surprising of all is the fact that beginning in 1807 Mennonite

churches in Holland took advantage of the privilege afforded by the state to all churches of Holland to accept grants of the state toward the support of the individual congregations. In 1912 for instance, forty Mennonite churches in Holland received grants from the state amounting to a total of approximately $5,000.

In Germany the development followed a similar course. It was the wealthy and educated Mennonites of northwestern Germany, of Emden, of Crefeld, and of neighboring areas, that first participated in the life of the state. In 1847 Herman von Beckerath, a member of the Mennonite church in Crefeld, entered the Prussian Parliament, where he remained a leading member for a number of years. In 1848 he was elected to the famous Frankfort revolutionary parliament from which parliament he also received appointment as minister of finance for Germany, a post which he occupied for several months. Later he was offered a post in the cabinet of Prussia which he rejected because of his political differences with the king. At the same Frankfort parliament Isaac Brons, deacon of the Mennonite church at Emden, also served as a member. Brons was a member of the city council of his home town, Emden, and was active in many other political affairs. He was vice-consul of Great Britain in Emden and was at one time assigned an important commission by the German government in connection with naval affairs. However, it was not until 1867 that full political rights were granted to the Mennonites of Prussia. After that time the Mennonites of eastern Prussia gradually participated more and more in political affairs, although, being chiefly farmers, they were never as active as the merchants and business men of the northwest German Mennonite churches. The development in south Germany proceeded somewhat more slowly, but ultimately Mennonites here also received full political rights, and gradually began to participate in the political life of their home regions and ultimately in the life of the nation at large.

It is a fact well worth noting, that participation in the life of the state went hand in hand with surrender of the principle of nonresistance. This was true not only on the Mennonite side but also on the side of the state. In fact the law of 1867 in Prussia which granted Mennonites full political rights, based this grant specifically on the fact that the Mennonites were no longer to enjoy exemption from military service, and that since they had now been placed on

an equality with other citizens in the matter of bearing the burdens which the state imposed, they also should be granted all the rights and privileges which the state had to grant to its citizens. In the light of the experience of the Mennonites of Holland and Germany, it is well for us to ask the question, Is it possible for Mennonites to maintain the principle of nonresistance and still to participate in the life of the state by holding elective offices or accepting appointments to official positions?

It is worth noting further that when the Mennonites did accept appointments to state positions, they apparently had no scruples against accepting appointments of a military character. As was pointed out earlier, a Dutch Mennonite became minister of the navy. The Isaac Brons mentioned above founded a society at Emden for the promotion of a German fleet. Herman von Beckerath made a speech in the Parliament of 1848 in which he objected to granting any special exemption from military service to groups which had religious scruples against such service, and this even though he was a Mennonite himself. In recent times in certain sections of Germany, Mennonites have become very active members of the National-Socialist Party. In fact, I have been told that in Eastern Prussia at first the party made its progress largely on the basis of Mennonite participation.

Today it is clear therefore that the old conflict between church and state so far as the Mennonites of Europe are concerned has completely vanished. It is clear furthermore that modern Mennonites in Europe have no scruples whatsoever against full participation in the life of the state on the same basis that non-Mennonites participate.

The Mennonites of Russia occupy a unique position historically in reference to the problem of the relationship of church and state, a position which is so different from that of the other European Mennonites that I prefer to treat their situation later on in this discussion in connection with a discussion of a similar situation in Paraguay.

Let us now turn our attention to church and state in the history of the Mennonites of America. Except for the very small settlement in Virginia and possibly in Maryland, the only portion of colonial America in which Mennonites settled before the adoption of the federal constitution of 1789, was the colony of Pennsylvania.

In Pennsylvania from the beginning, church and state were separate and full freedom of religion was granted to all except Catholics. Here for the first time in their history, Mennonites had full liberty of conscience, a liberty which has obtained from their settlement in Germantown in 1683 to the present day. Except for the unique situation at Germantown however, there is no record that the Mennonites participated directly in the life of the state in Pennsylvania. They could have been elected to the colonial assembly, and they could have occupied various posts in the colonial government if they had chosen to do so. There is no record of any such participation. In Pennsylvania too, for the first time in history, Mennonites had the right to vote subject to the laws of the colony governing suffrage. There is evidence that the Pennsylvania Mennonites exercised the right of voting without hesitation. In fact it is still the traditional custom in many Mennonite communities today to participate in voting and there is no regulation against such participation by laymembers in any of the eastern Mennonite conferences. Quite early in the history of the eastern conferences, however, regulations prohibiting office holding, are found, so that it is altogether probable that the opposition to office-holding was present from the very beginning of the settlement. The Oberholtzer faction which withdrew from the Franconia conference in 1847, and which ultimately became a part of the General Conference Mennonite branch, adopted a different point of view. I am not aware that members of this branch have actually been elected to the legislature of Pennsylvania, but I have been informed that there are at least two known cases of members who have served as sheriff.

The situation at Germantown referred to above is unique in American Mennonite history. This settlement was established in 1683 by thirteen families from Crefeld who at the time of their arrival were for the most part members of the Quaker church, but up to a few years before that time had been Mennonites. In essence their attitude on political matters therefore was the Mennonite attitude of their home church in Crefeld. During the course of the next 25 years at least 40 or 50 Mennonite families settled in this Germantown village community. They together with Quakers constituted the corporate members of the Germantown village government. The village had been incorporated in 1691 under the laws of the province, receiving a special charter. Since the Mennonites

and Quakers who had settled here were the corporate members of this borough which was a closed corporation, they had the exclusive right of franchise, of legislation, and of admitting new members into the corporation. They were therefore under obligation to establish and maintain a local municipal government. So long as the village ordinances and local litigation concerned itself chiefly with stray pigs and line fences, there was little difficulty in securing Quaker and Mennonite officials to serve, but with the building of a jail and the introduction of stocks and a whipping post they lost their desire for office. As early as 1701, Pastorius, the civil leader of the village, complained to Penn that he found it increasingly difficult to find men who would serve in the general court of Germantown for conscience' sake, and that he hoped for relief from the arrival of new immigrants. Several men declined to accept offices to which they had been elected. Finally in 1707 the village lost its charter, chiefly because it was unable to carry on the government which its charter required, and it was merged for political purposes with the township of which it was a part. In this interesting Germantown political experiment, we have a situation where the Mennonites and Quakers were in the majority and had the franchise and were unwilling to admit others to the franchise, but at the same time were unwilling to hold the offices necessary to operate the village government. We have here then an unparalleled instance of a municipal corporation losing its charter because no one was to be found who was willing to function as an official.

The history of the Mennonites and Amish Mennonites in America since Germantown, in respect to their attitude toward the relation of church and state, can be briefly summarized. Following the tradition and example set by the eastern settlement, the newer settlements in Ontario, Virginia and western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois apparently had no objection to the participation in voting, but did maintain a regulation on holding office. This latter rule, however, applied apparently only to offices above the county level, that is state offices, or offices requiring the use of force. There was seemingly no objection to holding such offices as road commissioners, school board members, school trustees, or even election officials. In a few cases Mennonites are known to have accepted election to the office of city councilman. A few years ago a Mennonite served as mayor of the town of Souderton, Montgomery County,

Pennsylvania in the Franconia conference district. In recent years opposition to holding local offices seems to have increased, and certainly opposition to voting has increased. However so far as I am informed no conference of the Mennonite church has yet prohibited voting, although all conferences forbid office-holding, and many advise against or forbid "electioneering."

The more liberal Mennonite branches, however, have had a different record in both the United States and Canada. Particularly is this true of the branch known as the General Conference of Mennonites of North America. This is due in part to the fact that some of the congregations of this group are composed of immigrants from South Germany after 1830 who took a more liberal position toward participation in the state in Germany. The only known members of the Mennonite church in America who have held an elective national office, come from two such churches of the General Conference branch in Iowa. A. W. Ramseyer served eighteen years in the federal House of Representatives from 1915 to 1933, since which time he has been a commissioner of the Court of Claims in Washington, D. C. Edward C. Eicher served six years in the federal House of Representatives, from 1933 to 1939, since which time he has been serving as a member of the Securities Exchange Commission.

One of the most noted politically active Mennonites in America was Peter Jansen, born in 1852 in Russia as the son of the noted Cornelius Jansen who was for a time Prussian Consul in Prussia and South Russia, who emigrated to Beatrice, Nebraska in 1873. Mr. Jansen began his political career in 1880 as Justice of the Peace. As early as 1884 he was elected an alternate delegate to the National Republican Convention in Chicago. In 1898 Jansen was elected a member of the Nebraska State Legislature, and in 1899 he was appointed U. S. Commissioner to the Paris Exposition by President McKinley. In 1910 he was elected to the State Senate of Nebraska. He states in his memoirs that he was frequently urged by friends to become a candidate for governor, but that his pronounced opposition to war and all that was military never permitted him to seek this honor, since as governor of the state he would also be an officer of the militia. He was also conscientiously opposed to the death penalty. H. P. Krehbiel of Newton, Kansas, also a member of the General Conference of Mennonites, served a number of terms as a member of the Kansas state legislature, as did J. A. Schowalter

of Newton, Kansas, a member of the same branch. A wider acquaintance with the other Mennonite branches would probably bring other cases of politically active Mennonites to light. Certainly there have been numerous mayors and members of city councils in these other groups, and the above list of politically active American Mennonites is by no means exhaustive.

In addition to the matter of active participation in political life, the relation of church and state in Mennonite history involves other topics, primarily those matters in which the state has endeavored to tell the Mennonites to perform duties or services or to take action contrary to the principles of the Mennonite faith. Under this heading would come first of all military service, second, forced contribution to the state for war purposes, forced services of a non-military character such as transportation of army supplies, swearing of the oath and such minor matters as saluting the flag and the use of a foreign language, jury service, and similar civic duties.

The one principle which is probably still held in common by all Mennonites around the world is that of non-swearing of oaths. Almost universally the governments under which Mennonites have lived have been willing to concede the Mennonites, like the Quakers, the right to give an affirmation in place of the oath in all legal proceedings where the oath is required of others. Without doubt some Mennonites are becoming lax in this principle, but nowhere are Mennonites compelled today to swear an oath against their conscience, not even in totalitarian Germany.

This is not the place to review the whole history of compulsory military service—that would be a chapter in itself. At the present time there is one country in the world which does not grant any exemption to Mennonites from military service. That country is France. Holland recently passed a law granting exemption from military service to conscientious objectors. In Germany it is also possible to secure exemption from combatant service both in peace time and in war time. Even in Russia it is still possible to secure exemption from combatant service although this is possible only under very strict regulations. In Switzerland Mennonites are granted exemption from combatant service. In all of these countries, however, there is very little disposition on the part of Mennonites to make use of their privileges. In fact in most of these countries Mennonites are proud to be active soldiers, and have among their

numbers officers up to the rank of general. This is true even in the Swiss army. Canada has absolute exemption for Mennonites from military service at all times according to the fundamental constitution of the Canadian Confederation enacted in 1867. In the U. S. A. most states grant Mennonites and others exemption from militia duties on conscientious grounds, but the federal government is not bound by the constitution or by any precedent to grant any exemption from military service. However, as a matter of fact, the federal government has always granted exemption from combatant service, and in the last world war finally granted Mennonites and others exemption from all forms of service for so called special farm furloughs or furloughs for reconstruction work in France. What the policy will be in the case of a future war is altogether determined by the congress in session at the time that the military service laws are passed.

It will not be possible here to review at length the whole problem of compulsory contribution to the cost of war in the form of war taxes. As early as 1777 a division occurred among the Mennonites in the Franconia Conference over the payment of war taxes. For the most part Mennonites have been willing to pay war taxes, because it is exceedingly difficult to determine what portion of the taxes was actually used for prosecution of the war and what portion was not so used. The attitude taken by some conscientious objectors, that war taxes should not be paid or that that portion of the current taxes which are devoted to military preparation should be paid only under protest, has not found widespread approval among Mennonites. I am not well enough informed on the history of compulsory service in the transportation of military supplies to discuss this matter, but I know that in the War of 1812 Mennonites of the two settlements in what is now Waterloo County, Ontario, were impressed into transporting supplies for the retreating British army which had been defeated at Detroit. There is evidence that in other wars Mennonites have either been impressed into service or have voluntarily hired themselves out for the transport of army supplies.

Jury service is required of all eligible citizens in most states whenever the lot falls on them. So far as I know however, citizens are nowhere impressed into jury service if it is against their conscientious scruples. As a matter of fact Mennonites have served on juries, and do now serve on juries with the exception possibly of

capital cases involving the death penalty. In our own branch, conferences have frequently advised against or forbidden jury service. In a few instances Mennonites have objected to compulsory salute to the flag and the recitation of the loyalty pledge in the public schools. In most cases, however, Mennonites have not felt that the flag salute or the pledge of allegiance is contrary to their faith. In recent years the oath of allegiance required of those who wish to become naturalized citizens has led to difficulty. This oath includes a pledge to defend the constitution and the nation by bearing arms. Mennonites cannot conscientiously take this oath. However, since no one is compelled to become a citizen, there is no necessary conflict between the church and state on this point. Native-born inhabitants of this country are not required to take such an oath of allegiance.

I now wish to call attention to an altogether different phase of the problem of church and state in Mennonite history, one which has escaped the attention of most Mennonites interested in this problem. I refer to those instances in Mennonite history where Mennonite colonies have been granted local political autonomy by the state under whose sovereignty they reside. These cases involve in actual effect the erection of Mennonite states. A study of these autonomous or semi-autonomous Mennonite states sheds an interesting light on the whole problem of church and state.

The first instance of this in Mennonite history is the autonomy granted to the Mennonite colonies in South Russia by the czarist government. In 1763 the Russian government offered special inducements to secure German colonists in the newly acquired south Russian farm lands. Among other things all immigrants were promised the right to establish their own schools, churches and forms of local government, together with military exemption. A special invitation was extended to Mennonites of eastern Prussia in 1786, with very liberal terms and grants of aid in addition to the terms offered to the German colonists in general. These privileges were confirmed in a perpetual charter granted in 1800. We are interested just now in the guarantee of local autonomy to the Mennonite colony. Their affairs were placed in the hands of a governmental committee placed directly under the national cabinet. Under the committee was a government director who was to be closely in touch with the local community. Within the Mennonite colonies, however,

all strictly local affairs were given over to the Mennonites themselves. They were given the right to elect their own officials and to establish their own local laws and to govern themselves quite freely. They thus constituted a sort of democracy within the Russian autocracy, and they enjoyed much greater freedom than did native Russian communities. At the head of each of the two major Mennonite colonies was a general superintendent called "Oberschulz," elected by representatives from the different villages. Each village in turn elected its own magistrate, called "Schulz," and each likewise had its own village assembly that governed the village. There was also a representative assembly to govern the entire colony. Since all the inhabitants of the Mennonite districts were either members of the Mennonite church or members of Mennonite families, and no non-Mennonites were permitted to live in the colony, this was a pure Mennonite state. The actual conduct of government fell largely to the local village assembly and the village magistrate. To the Mennonite magistrate fell the lot of administering local discipline. Whipping was a frequent method of punishment. The village meetings handled such questions as schools, teachers, roads, caring for the poor, distributing surplus land, etc. Thus we see that practically all the functions of local government were carried on by the Mennonites themselves.

If we examine the situation more closely we discover that actually the government approached a form of theocracy. Even though the elders or bishops were not at the head of civil affairs, yet as heads of the church they exercised great influence over matters of government, especially over the schools which were largely controlled by the church. Frequently also the magistrates requested the elders to assist them in many local affairs. Later on the strong influence of the elders in the village government declined. It is needless to say that it was not always easy to carry out the principles of nonresistance and opposition to the use of force which all the Mennonites of Russia firmly believed in, and at the same time maintain the discipline necessary for a stable order and to carry out the functions of local self-government. To lead a fellow-member to the whipping post required considerable rationalization of the injunction "Resist not evil." The most serious breach of Mennonite principles occurred when certain Mennonite ministers and laymen left the old church, once in 1820 and once in 1860, to form other branches. It is shock-

ing to report, but true, that the elders or bishops of the old Mennonite church at that time requested the Russian government to deport the schismatic Mennonite leaders to Siberia in order to get them out of the Mennonite settlements. They also opposed the government granting the schismatic Mennonites any of the privileges which Mennonites were supposed to enjoy in Russia.

It is interesting to note that when the Russian government attempted to cancel most of the privileges of the Mennonites as well as the other German colonists of Russia, about 1870, a large number of the Russian Mennonites were prepared to leave the country. Under the pressure of the threatened emigration the Russians withdrew part of their proposals, especially that cancelling exemption from military service. A compromise was reached according to which the Mennonite population, through the Mennonite civil organization of their autonomous colony self-government, undertook to provide a substitute service for the state in the form of a voluntary forestry service. This service, which was inaugurated in 1880, was financed by the Mennonites themselves. It corresponds closely to the United States government C. C. C. service. At first it called for four years of service, but later this was reduced to three. Before the recent world war there were eight forestry camps in which a total of about 1,000 young men were serving. The entire cost of this service was borne by the Mennonites themselves. During the World War the privilege of non-combatant service among the Mennonites was maintained by the Russian government. The Soviet government has of course cancelled all of the special rights of the Mennonite colony except that providing for non-combatant military service, so that the great experiment of Mennonite self-government in south Russia has come to an end. So far as I know no one has ever assessed the value of this experiment or drawn any conclusion from it for the problem of the relation of church and state. However, on the whole I would be inclined to say that the experiment was a success and that it offers one solution of the problem of maintaining a nonresistant, non-participating Mennonite social group in the midst of a state which requires service to the state in some form or other. However, this seems possible only in an age when nationalism is not strong, where the government is not totalitarian and where the presence of a large block of foreign people speaking a foreign language and maintaining a foreign culture isolated from the na-

tional community would not lead to serious trouble.* It is scarcely conceivable that such an arrangement would be tolerated in any progressive, prosperous, well-ordered national state in the western world today.

The second instance of Mennonite self-government is found in the Mennonite colonies in Paraguay. In the year 1921, the Paraguayan parliament passed a law guaranteeing to all Mennonite settlers in the extensive territory known as the Gran Chaco, exceptional privileges which are strikingly similar to the privileges granted to the Mennonites of Russia in 1786. According to this law the Mennonites have full self-government in the Chaco. For ten years after arrival no taxes of any sort were to be collected by the government. The autonomy of the Mennonites in the Paraguayan Chaco is greater than that of the Mennonites in Russia. As a matter of fact the Mennonites of the Chaco do constitute an absolutely independent state. There has never been any application of any of the laws of Paraguay to them in the Chaco, there has never been any police officer or government officer in the colony to exercise any authority on behalf of the national government, the courts of the land have never interfered with the Mennonites of the Chaco, and the army in its occupation of the Chaco has never presumed to exercise authority.

There are two Mennonite states in the Chaco. The first is the Canadian Russian Mennonite colony known as "Menno Colony", established in 1928, and which is a pure theocracy. Until last year this colony was governed altogether by the elders and ministers. Last year finally this colony was organized, primarily for economic purposes, under the leadership of an "Oberschulz" or general superintendent. However this new organization does not exercise the function of a political state. In so far as these functions are exercised they still reside in the hands of the bishop or elder.

The second Mennonite state was established on land near to the first in the year 1930 by Mennonite refugees from Russia. This colony is known as the "Fernheim Colony." It has been organized on identical lines after the pattern of the ancient Mennonite autonomous organization in South Russia. Each village has its local

* Such a Mennonite group need not of course be a foreign language or foreign culture group. It could speak the national language and share in general the national culture.

magistrate or "Schulz" elected by the people, and the entire colony has a general superintendent or "Oberschulz." The colony assembly, consisting of all of the heads of the families in the colony, is the legislative assembly. The local village assemblies, together with the general colony assembly, establish all the laws governing the colony. They have also established all the judicial procedure necessary to settle disputes. Although the Mennonite elders and bishops in this colony also exercise great influence, they have nothing to do directly with the civil organization of the colony.

On the whole this form of Mennonite self-government in Paraguay has been very successful to the present date. It has been possible to maintain law and order without using force with the exception of one or two instances where it was necessary to administer corporal punishment to recalcitrant striplings. It is true of course that those who are dissatisfied with the order in the colony can leave, and are probably under so much social pressure that they voluntarily leave before they become serious problems to the authorities. But in any case, for ten years these Mennonite states have existed in the heart of South America without the use of force, and have maintained a degree of law and order, industry, sobriety and peace, which is almost without a parallel in the world of our day which is so full of strife, struggle, conflict and bloodshed.

It is difficult to say whether the autonomous Mennonite colonies in South Russia, and the two independent Mennonite colonies in South America, present a union of church and state in an ideal form or not. It is true that in these colonies the church governed or governs itself without interference from or support from the civil government. That is, the Mennonite churches in these colonies have not been subjected to or made a part of the civil government. Nor has the church in its organized form, that is in its regular meetings or conferences, dictated on the other hand to the government. The functions of church and state have been maintained as completely separate functions, the functions of the state being exercised by the civil assemblies, and the functions of the church being exercised by the ecclesiastical assemblies. Yet it is the same people who are members of both the civil and ecclesiastical assemblies, with the few exceptions of those church members who have been excommunicated, or those who have grown up without being baptized and joining the church. However, it is true beyond the shadow of a doubt that

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

the actual leadership of this joint life in the Mennonite colony, both in Russia and South America, has always been in the hands of the elders and ministers. It is inconceivable that anything could be done in these colonies that would be contrary to the teachings and wishes of the church leaders. Thus in effect if not in form there is an amalgamation of the church and state. Is this not an ideal solution to the problem? However, as is said above in speaking of the Mennonites of Russia, this solution seems to be possible only in a state which is not well developed nor prosperous and which has large open spaces in which it is possible to settle blocks of foreign population without interfering with the national life in general. Paraguay is a poor country with a small population and with large unoccupied areas of land. It is very anxious to secure settlers and it is willing to pay the price of granting practical independence to such foreign groups as the Mennonites in order to secure the benefit of their service in the development of the state, at least in the Gran Chaco territory.

As we conclude this survey of Mennonite history, several basic issues in the relation of church and state stand out clearly. The first is that of participation in the organized political forms of the state, that is participation in government. Historically Mennonites were not permitted to participate until approximately the year 1800. Since that time the Mennonites of Europe have entered into full participation both in voting and office holding in the states in which they are settled in Europe. In America apparently only the conservative groups, chiefly our own branch, still maintain consistently the principle of non-participation in government. However, even among us this is consistently applied only to the higher officers in the state. Participation in strictly local affairs is not absolutely prohibited. The right of franchise has apparently always been exercised in America by our people. Although in recent years there is a tendency against this, no doubt a majority of Mennonite men have no scruples against voting whenever they feel led to do so. No state, however, compels participation in government, not even in voting. Therefore there cannot be a serious conflict between the Mennonite church and the state over the question of participation in government.

The second major issue is that of obedience to the state. Here the Mennonites have universally followed the principle of obey-

ing the state as far as possible, both in the payment of taxes and in the performance of duties imposed upon them by the law, and in general obedience to the laws of both local and national governments. The only serious conflict with the state in this matter has arisen when states have interfered with freedom of worship, which is now fortunately past, or when service has been required of a military nature. Even here during most of past Mennonite history and at the present time, military service can be avoided by Mennonites who wish to avoid it, and in Canada and Paraguay even non-combatant military service is not required. According to the precedent set in this country by the Civil War and the World War, as well as the general attitude of the leaders of our government, it is probable that Mennonites who are willing to perform non-combatant service will not come into conflict with the state in this country. Certainly those who are willing to perform non-combatant service in the army would also have no difficulty in carrying out any other orders issued by the state in connection with the prosecution of the war such as rendering service to industry or transportation. However, those Mennonites who are unwilling to perform non-combatant service or to participate in any way in the prosecution of a war, either financially or by any kind of personal service, and this number is still very large among the Mennonites of America, face the probability of conflict with the American state if another war comes. It is becoming increasingly clear to all of us that the next war will be a totalitarian war in which all the resources of the nation will be harnessed to the supreme goal of winning a complete victory. Thus our own native America may still be the scene of a serious conflict between the Mennonite church and the state, and we may once again be brought to the place where our martyr ancestors stood when they refused to accept the dictation of the state in which they lived regarding the practice of their religious faith and principles. It is a good thing that in preparation for such a possible conflict the Mennonite Church through its General Conference has expressed itself clearly and unequivocally on this question in the general conference statement of 1937 on "Peace, War and Military Service."

THE OBLIGATION OF THE CHRISTIAN TO THE STATE AND COMMUNITY— "RENDER TO CAESAR"

EDWARD YODER

The saying of Jesus, "Render to Caesar therefore the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," was spoken under circumstances familiar to most of us. An imposing and strangely constituted delegation of the Lord's opponents, secretly designing to entrap Him in some way by His words, waited on Him one day. Very respectfully, to all outward appearances, they addressed Him. Their mouths were full of honeyed words and fine phrases. They complimented Him on His impartiality toward all kinds of people, and on His sincerity in teaching God's way of truth. The fulsome compliment must have been quite enough to tickle the vanity of an ordinary human teacher and to throw him off guard. But Jesus was not taken in by their specious words of flattery. He saw they were merely acting the part of innocent inquirers; hypocrites, play-actors, He calls them (Gospel of Mark 12:13-17).

The carefully framed question which these inquirers addressed to the Master was: "Is it right to give the poll-tax to the Emperor or not?" The answer He gave was a puzzling one to the people then, and it still is somewhat so to us. In one way the reply appears to lay down a profound and far-reaching principle in connection with the Christian's relation to the civil state. It calls attention to the fact that men do have obligations and responsibilities both to society and to God. Yet, what is the exact scope and relation of these obligations? Does He sanction a thoroughgoing dualism by which every activity in one's experience can be labelled as due to Caesar or due to God? Are the two categories parallel and mutually exclusive? Or, on the other hand, does Christ imply that the realm of obligation to God is all-inclusive, and that Caesar's due is a particular segment of the total area of human responsibility? Numerous questions of this and similar nature come to mind as one begins to study and analyze the statement Jesus made to His questioners.

In fact, from a practical standpoint, the statement of Jesus appears to answer no question, except the one immediately asked, that Jews should pay the emperor's poll-tax, that such taxes are an obligation due to Caesar. Aside from that one point, the statement appears more confusing than enlightening. Apart from the tax, what are the things that belong to Caesar, and what are the things belonging to God? The fact is that militarists have many times relied on this very text to prove that everyone owes military service when Caesar calls upon them to render the same. And so with various other items which the state at times demands of citizens.

By way of digression, one wonders if it be possible that this statement of Christ's was similar in kind and in tone to others He made to critical opponents? Was it perhaps purposely expressed in an enigmatical way, so as to baffle His insincere questioners the more? One thinks here of that occasion where He mystified His critics in the Temple, when they had asked for a token of His authority for driving the commercial traffickers from the sacred precincts. Quickly came the mysterious answer: "Raze this sanctuary, and in three days I'll raise it." A profound and prophetic answer, one which His disciples understood years later, but at the moment no one understood it. It was what might today be termed a "poser," a tantalizing problem that bewildered His opponents and left them in a quandary on their low, earthly level of thinking and reasoning.

The thoughts of Jesus naturally ran on a high, spiritual level, He always thought of things in terms of God and His will. When the critics came to Him with their trivial questions, questions conceived in a low order of worldly thinking, His divine patience was no doubt tried many a time. He always answered them respectfully, though sometimes, one suspects, not without a touch of humor in suggesting such novel and startling ideas as for the moment took their breath away. So in the case of the tribute question, the Lord, without answering their petty question with a "yes" or "no," and without entering upon a discussion of the relation of Church and state, amazed both the quibblers and the people who heard Him by suggesting a point of view on the question which somehow had escaped their puzzled thinking on the matter. They had just never thought of the tribute question in the light of anything higher than their patriotic feeling and their own pocket books. It had never occurred to these people so busy with their religious traditions and their

petty political thoughts that God had anything to do with paying taxes.

In order, therefore, to find out what Jesus taught about the Christian's duty and obligation to the world of civil society, we must turn to other passages than the one about the tribute money.

In a discussion of this kind we talk about the state. What is the state? Or, as a better form of this question might be, What is a state? We believe it can be said with truth that a state, as we think of it in connection with this subject, is not something mystical and idealistic. The state, or a state, has no real existence apart from the people who compose it. Too often in speaking or thinking of the state people assume that the state is somehow an entity in itself, some vague sort of super-being, something above the human level, something that has a real objective existence quite apart from the people who compose the same. Philosophers may discuss the state in an ideal or ideological sense. But for practical purposes we must take a realistic view of a state as a community of persons.

What is a community? Community is perhaps a more definite and clear-cut concept in people's thinking than state, for it is more directly and immediately a part of their common experience. We know pretty well what a neighborhood is. Wherever people live in close proximity to each other and unite in carrying on certain activities in common, there we have a community. A community may also be determined by common interests and practices without being marked off by geographical limits. In the ordinary sense a community is geographically determined, as in a city, village, school district, township, or other convenient unit. In a city the people of the community unite their efforts in providing certain conveniences and utilities for their common use. They join together in paying for roads, paved streets, sanitation systems, and other community projects. This illustrates what is generally understood by the term community.

A state or nation is best thought of as simply a community on a larger scale than the home neighborhood with which the individual is more directly familiar. Modern means of communication and transportation have gradually extended our concept of community to larger geographical areas. A state may seem less real to us as a community than the home neighborhood because of its larger area, because of the wider diversity of people included in it, most of

whom are strangers to us personally. The workings of a state in its community activities seems farther away. The average member of this larger community has little immediate contact with or knowledge of those who happen to direct the affairs of the state. And whatever is distant and strange to us is apt to seem mysterious and foreign. In general it should help us in thinking about our subject, if we avoid the thought or feeling that the state exists as something apart or beyond the people who compose the larger community we know by that term.

If we can keep this realistic view of the matter in mind, the problem before us should be rendered more simple in its approach. For the Christian the state is a community of people living and working together in certain ways. Insofar as these people may be ignoring or opposing God they are a phase of, or a part of, what in the Scripture is referred to as the "world." Jesus thought of God as the one supreme reality, and all human affairs He viewed in terms of God. Whatever among men was not oriented toward God, He referred to as the "world." If men were hostile to God or to the things of God, they were of the world. From His point of view men and human affairs had meaning only as viewed from God's standpoint. Human beings, whether they were emperors, or rulers, publicans or beggars, were all alike in His eyes, people lost and in need of God. He talked little about the empire, or government, or society, for they had no significance in themselves. The pretensions of men to authority or greatness meant nothing to Him, and that is the reason He had so little patience with the political question about the tribute.

The Christian believer holds a twofold relation to the community, whether we think now of the small, local community where he may know the people fairly well and works with them, or of the larger community which we know as a state. Jesus recognized this twofold relationship distinctly. In His great prayer, as recorded in John 17, He affirmed that the disciples whom He was leaving behind Him were "in the world," that is, they were in a real sense still members of the ordinary human community, living in contact with neighbors and friends, exerting their influence among fellow men by example and testimony, co-operating with them in a common civil life.

On the other hand He also affirmed that the disciples were "not

of the world." They were not of the world in the same sense that Christ was not of the world. His followers are present in the civil community and have certain connections with and certain responsibilities toward the community. Yet the center of gravity of their life does not lie in this plane of experience, but their real life is centered in God. The relationship is further emphasized when Christ prayed not that the Father should take the disciples out of the world, but that He would keep them from the evil one. The inner life of the world, the spirit of the civil community that is not in touch with God, is dominated by the enemy of God, the evil one. So while the believers are present in the world, they are still not of the world. They are on the spiritual side of their life not a part of the great society of men. Their interests, their ideals, their principles of life are not drawn from the surrounding community; the sustenance of their inner life and being is derived from God, in whom their life is hid with Christ.

The apostle Paul recognized the same dual relationship of the believers to the civil community of mankind. He tells the Corinthian brethren not to associate on intimate terms with immoral people and covetous people and idolaters. Still, he goes on to say, he does not mean they should have nothing whatever to do with such people, for to do that they would needs leave the world entirely. They must have such ordinary civil contacts with sinful people as the community life requires, but they are not to live on terms of close social, personal, and spiritual fellowship with them. They are to draw the strength and nourishment for their inner life from some source outside the civil community in which they live and a part of which they still are. Their real life, the life of the spirit, must feed upon higher and nobler things than the civil community out of touch with God can provide.

Holding in mind this twofold relationship which the Christian bears to the community of civil society, it is further necessary to consider what this means, first to the individual believer, and second as regards his concept of the world, or the civil community. One point is certain, that the believer is a single integrated personality as he sustains this twofold relationship. While he is both in the world and not of the world, he is not a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde; he cannot live a part of his time "in the world" in one manner, and the remainder of his time "not of the world" in some other manner.

He is a single person who lives all the time for God in the world, and all the time for God not of the world. This is really a paradox and can hardly be satisfactorily resolved by any facile, off-hand definitions and formulas.

What does this mean? Turning to the words of Jesus for an answer, we find in the Sermon on the Mount certain pointed suggestions that help define the believer's relation to the world or the surrounding civil community of which as a human being he is a member. "Ye are the salt of the earth," Jesus told His followers. "There is nothing more useful than salt and sunshine," wrote the elder Pliny (N. H. 31. 9, 45, 102). Salt in ordinary life was used chiefly to preserve food from corruption (it was before the day of electric refrigeration), and for making it more pleasant and palatable to the taste. Christians whose personal character is like that described in the Beatitudes will make the truth of God more acceptable and attractive to those about him. They act as a preservative to the general society of men in that their influence leads others to do right rather than wrong, their testimony to the truth of God leads some to know God, and these influences do something to counteract the tendency of humanity to sink lower and lower in the mire of sin and moral corruption.

Society, or the civil community as a whole, is morally and spiritually about what the people are who compose it. Every live, spiritual Christian in a community makes that community better. Jesus certainly expected His followers to influence the world in the direction of better things. Just in what way they are to do this we shall consider later. In order to be the salt of the earth, a preservative and seasoning force in society, the Christians must be in actual contact with the community, they are to be 'in the world', as Jesus expressed it. There is no ground in the teachings of Jesus for asceticism, or for any extreme form of isolation and separation from the general civil community of mankind. The Lord warned against the salt losing its savor or salty quality. The Christians raise the moral level of the world only when they do not allow their morality to be lowered by the world to its level. The words of Jesus also imply the opposite warning, that the Christians who remove themselves from contact with the community are quite as useless and savorless as the salt that has lost its strength and distinctness. Both those who have lost their holy and pure character as Christians and

those who isolate themselves from contact with their fellow men in daily living have lost their savor.

Jesus used another metaphor for illustrating the relationship of the believer to the world. "Ye are the light of the world." The words of Alfred Plummer, in commenting upon this saying of Jesus, are worth quoting: "If the Christian must live in the world in order to save it from moral decay, he must also live above it and aloof from it, like a light on a high place illuminating far and wide. By his own life he will show what true life is. In both metaphors the emphasis is on character; on what men are rather than on what they accomplish. Good salt cannot help giving a wholesome savour. Unobscured light cannot help shining. So also the man whose character reflects the Beatitudes cannot help being a wholesome and illuminating influence. Such a man cannot and will not isolate himself; his goodness will be infectious. Christian character is not individual and selfish, but social and beneficent. To attend only to his own soul is to lose savour and to obscure light."

These two simple metaphors picture for us something of what the Christian's twofold relationship to the world of civil society means to the believer himself. He is in the world, that is, he is in contact with the civil community of which he is a necessary part. He takes his part with neighbors in such community activities as are necessary and right. And through this contact the higher life and the purer character that is in him influence the world or the community to a higher morality and level of conduct. At the same time he is above the general moral level of the great society and shines as a light on a high place, and thus his life illuminates many others and benefits them.

Looking now at another side of this subject, what does this relationship of the believer to the community mean as regards the community itself? How shall the believer regard the world, the community of mankind, in the light of his responsibility as suggested by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount? What thought attitudes and emotional attitudes shall he take toward the general society of the world? How shall he make sure that he keeps the true salty quality of his Christian character? How shall he avoid becoming isolated and separated in a way that he becomes useless and his light is obscured? These are deep and searching questions as one thinks upon them.

In the Scriptures society or the total community of mankind is referred to as "this evil world." How evil is the world? Can it be made better than it is? Is it God's purpose to make society good and righteous? These too are questions not easy to answer. The Christian may be happy that he does not have to explain and answer them in any final way. For no man can know the mind of God.

It seems simple to say that society or a community is composed of individual persons, and that the moral performance of the group as a whole will be about as good or about as bad as that of the people who compose it. If there were a community, large or small, for example, of which every member were a genuine Christian in life and conduct, we assume it would be a Christian community. There are some thinkers, however, who have reflected upon the evils and troubles of the modern world and who say the moral problem of society is not quite so simple as that. Moral evil, so they claim, has a mysterious way of compounding itself in a group or society that contains various kinds of people. In the interaction of people in a community life the evil side tends to come to the surface rather than the good. That is, a group or class or community of men will do worse things than any single individual among them would do. Corporate selfishness, for example, becomes predatory and aggressive to a degree that individual selfishness seldom does. A number of years ago Professor Reinhold Niebuhr published a book entitled, *Moral Man and Immoral Society.* His thesis was that the individual human being can become moral and ethical in his personal relationships, but that communal man, the community or society at large never becomes moral. In other words group behaviour is always immoral. The individual can learn to act out of love and mutuality toward others, but groups of men are inevitably selfish, and their collective selfishness can in no wise be restrained except by some use of force. This is one man's way of viewing this evil world. He tends to see society as incurably evil, and believes that the ethics of Jesus, love, nonresistance, forgiveness, and so forth cannot apply here.

To most Christians the evils that exist in human society, such as class conflict, oppression and exploitation, conflict between capital and labor, war and international conflict, greed and imperialism, appear far too complex to be understood. Some reformers claim to be able to analyze these troubles and discover their causes. They

think too that they know the remedy for them and they work diligently to change the world for the better. However most people are more or less frightened and terrified when they look upon conditions in this evil world. Because they cannot readily understand and analyze the causes and know of no direct, practical way to change matters, they tend to feel there is something awful, sinister, and mysterious behind it all.

Here the Christian's faith in God should keep him from becoming a complete pessimist. God, he knows, understands the troubles of community and state. He certainly has a controlling hand in the communal affairs of mankind. He understands fully all the mysterious workings and ramifications of human sin in the interrelationship of men in society. Just how God works against sin in this form and what His full purposes are regarding it the believer does not know. Yet neither does his lack of understanding discourage him. The fate of the world and of society is in hands that are stronger than human hands. The kingdom of God is God's rule and not man's.

At the same time that the Christian stands more or less confused and frightened in the face of the moral evil that characterizes the world and its communal life, he is forced by circumstances to do some thinking about the matter. While he trusts God and believes in a divine Providence that overrules everything that takes place, he is not indifferent toward the community and the problems that arise out of his necessary contacts with the community. He does not hide his head in the sand, ostrichlike, and make himself believe there is no real problem here. He is after all in some sense a real part of the civil community around him. He cannot entirely withdraw from it, without going out of the world altogether. He will in his own mind assume attitudes toward the community that affect his decision on what is his own responsibility and obligation toward the state and community.

Besides the obvious responsibility to influence the general society through Christlike character and life, as salt and as light, one other responsibility may be suggested at this point for consideration. As stated, Christian believers are in some way more or less inescapably a part of the state and community. As such they have some part, remote and even involuntary, in all the state or community does. We may like to feel that we do not have such a part be-

cause we are opposed to some things that are done, and yet, we cannot help having some share therein. We pay taxes, often indirectly today, and some part of our contribution goes to pay for wars and war armaments. Perhaps it is none of our responsibility as to what is done with the tax money after it is paid, and again perhaps it is. Still the Christian conscience should not be too ready to wash its hands of the whole matter. At any rate it cannot be out of place for the Christian to feel a genuine sorrow and express a genuine repentance and confession for the sins of his national community. As did Daniel and Nehemiah and other prophets in Israel, so should Christians feel moved to confess the sins of the nation of which they are a part. To stand aloof in a self-righteous manner and assert that the sins and evils of the community are not our responsibility seems just a little like the action of the Pharisee who prayed in the Temple and proudly thanked God that he was not as bad as some other people.

Coming back again to the problem of what attitudes the believer should take as he tries to find the will of God for himself in his relation to the community and state, further questions such as these may be asked: What is God's attitude toward the world and toward the corporate society that composes it? Does God plan or desire to redeem the world and society? Does He ask Christians to work directly, or indirectly, or not at all, at improving the world and the conditions in it? The consideration of questions like these will enter into the problem of what we shall accept as our responsibility to the state and the community. Perhaps it is impossible to answer these questions finally and categorically with "yes" or "no." They go back after all to the believer's faith, his understanding of the Scriptures, and his conception of what the will of God is.

It may help us in our thinking on the matter to notice briefly in passing some answers that Christian thinkers have been giving to such questions as the above. In Europe today what is referred to as Continental Theology would teach us that human society, the state or community as such, cannot be salvaged, that God does not mean to save it and He does not expect men to try to save it by making it Christian. Sin and divine judgment are so much part and parcel of the evil world system that these thinkers conclude society and the human community cannot be permanently improved. Instead, they would say, God saves individual souls out of this evil world. And

for men to try to improve the evil conditions of the community of mankind by applying to it Christian principles appears to them futile, if not presumptuous. This is what one might call a pessimistic view of history.

In contrast to the pessimistic view of history and the hopeless outlook upon the conditions of society is another view that has been widely held in America. This view in its most outspoken form has been known as the social gospel. People holding to this view say that God is concerned to save not only the individual soul, but to save the individual in society and eventually to redeem society as well. They believe that society, the community, and the state can and should be made Christian. In its extremely modernistic phase this view has maintained that it is only as society is made Christian that the individual himself can really be a Christian in his life and conduct. Therefore the proponents of the social gospel have worked hard and earnestly to improve the living conditions of the masses of people, to remove the causes of poverty and crime, and in general to create conditions in society which will help the individual instead of hindering him in living the Christian life. This is sometimes called the optimistic or humanistic view of history. Its serious weakness is, of course, the fact that it leads to an exaltation of man's efforts and a minimizing of God's working in history.

Without attempting to evaluate in full these contrasting views of God's work and purpose in history and among humanity, we shall here point out regarding each view just one or two things that bear on this discussion. The first view mentioned, that God saves the individual soul out of the evil world, is entirely scriptural, though the corollary that He is concerned to save only the individual soul and do nothing for society may be questioned on scriptural grounds. The serious weakness of this view as emphasized today is its assumption that the individual's salvation, his complete redemption from sin, is not in any wise conditioned by his surroundings. The Barthian theologian, so far as the writer understands his position, would say that salvation is altogether a vertical transaction, a matter between God and the individual soul, an experience which the surrounding community or state or society cannot affect one way or another. From their standpoint there is no particular reason or need to do anything toward improving the moral conditions of society, for that would be useless, if not presumptuous.

The contrary position, that of the one who advocates the social gospel, while it is, we believe unscriptural in its approach and emphasis, does have this much of truth in it, in that it takes a broader view of what salvation really is. For salvation affects not only a person's relation to God but also his relation to fellow men. The individual's salvation, his character and spiritual life are affected very markedly by his surroundings, by the community in which he lives. The extreme social gospeler is wrong in making salvation largely or altogether a horizontal transaction, teaching that man's salvation is wholly conditioned by his surroundings, just as the modern Barthian is wrong in teaching that the individual's redemption is in no way affected or conditioned by the surroundings amid which he lives. The former takes too light and superficial a view of human sin, while the latter seems to take too limited a view of God's work in human history.

Noting now these conflicting views about God's work of saving men and the world, it is interesting to compare them on the points mentioned with the Mennonite position. This position is that salvation begins as a personal matter between the individual soul and God. In this respect we agree with the Barthian view. But we disagree by saying that it does not end there. Salvation includes a certain type of moral and ethical living, an application of the teachings of Christ to every relationship in life. Moral and ethical living cannot take place in a vacuum, it must always be done in a society or community of people. It includes growth in character and the integration of personality around truth and righteousness, which is not possible except in living with other people as well as with God. In the majority of cases progress in holiness and purity of life is quite definitely conditioned by the individual's surroundings. On the latter point we are in agreement with the advocates of the social gospel. But we differ from them again by saying that saved individuals change society rather than that a good environment makes saved people. The starting point for effective changes in society is the individual's own faith in God.

What is the outcome of these several views? The Barthian makes no direct effort to improve the world and the state and the community. The social gospeler devotes his chief efforts to improving the social and political conditions of the world so that people can be better Christians. Mennonites on their part approach the

problem in a rather different way. They seek to create a community of their own, a special society of restricted membership, a little world apart in which saved individual Christians can grow and develop in spiritual character and power. They interpret the New Testament as teaching that the Church is a special community of Christian believers, people living to a greater or less degree a common life in an environment that helps them live according to Christ's teachings.

As a result Mennonites throughout their history have made the Church more or less a closely integrated, closely knit community. To them the Church is something more than just a sector of the general population of men. In varying degrees at different times and places this special community, the Church, has with them had definite and practical social, cultural, economic, and religious aspects of its own. At times this community has been almost self-contained economically and culturally. Different groups of Mennonites have carried the principle of the Church as a special community out in different ways. The Hutterian Brethren, for instance, have carried it out in the form of a genuine religious communism. Others in less extreme ways have applied the same principle toward maintaining enough of a common life to preserve the idea of a special community of their own. This main principle runs throughout the history of our people. In the spiritual community of the Church, with its spirit of intimate fellowship and brotherhood, the individual Christian has his moral and spiritual roots, so to speak. From the midst of his group, rather than from society at large, he draws the sustenance for his inner life as a human being, and amid this specialized environment the Christian develops strength of moral and ethical character.

But the Church as a special community is not an end in itself, at least what good the individual member gets from this community is not itself an end for him. In this sheltered and specially favored environment he gains ideals, nurture, strength, conviction, and so forth. This equipment he is to use in his living of the Christian life in the larger society of mankind, in the civil community and the world. For we will bear in mind that he is still in a real sense in the world. He has instructions to use his facilities and opportunities in doing good to all men, in loving his enemies, in spreading the gospel of Christ to all the world, in teaching the truth of God's

word to all men everywhere. These are specific responsibilities which the believer owes to the world and the community.

These definite responsibilities seem to be entirely in line with the teaching of Jesus about the Christians being the salt of the earth and the light of the world. The question is whether personal living, teaching and evangelizing exhaust the area of influence intended by the metaphors of the salt and the light. It is in the application of these metaphors that Christian people differ. The social gospelers claim them as ground for their activity in working directly for world betterment. Certainly, as we have already seen, Jesus implied that the Christians must be in actual contact with the people of the civil community and state, and that the purpose of this contact is to preserve and improve the community. But how is this contact to be made in a practical way and exactly in what ways is the good influence to be exerted upon the community? Various answers have been given in practice. Some have advocated and practiced direct action to eliminate specific evils and introduce Christian standards. Even those who advocate direct action differ as to the means. Some would use only ethical means, that is, means not involving violence and compulsion, others would use whatever means may be necessary to get the desired results. The direct actionists would work directly to establish justice, righteousness, and better morals through agitation, legislation, reform movements, and so on. Those who refuse all kinds of direct action would do so because such action generally leads to the use of unethical means and to a too close spiritual co-operation with others who work from an entirely different point of view.

The believers in the social gospel have been direct actionists, that is, they have understood it to be the Christian's duty to work immediately for better government, better laws, better control of the immoral and unethical practices found in the general society of men. They have observed that the evil forces in society are not generally amenable to moral persuasion, love, good will, those means which are understood to be ethical according to the teachings of Christ. Therefore to get something practical done toward a better society they compromise the ethics of the New Testament and for the moment sanction the use of whatever means seem expedient for getting direct results. Some of these compromisers are honest enough to admit that they are sinning in using and in advising the use of force

to maintain what they regard as a necessary measure of relative order and relative security in society and the state. Others who use the same means are not quite so honest, but rationalize their action by trying to prove it is in accordance with Christ's teaching after all.

Mennonites have been one among the groups in Christian history that have attempted to apply without compromise the New Testament ethic of love and non-resistance to evil, or as nearly as possible without compromise. They too saw the evil of the surrounding world as formidable, and to them like to other observers it appeared that violence, greed, and the predatory activities of the corporate society could not be restrained by ethical means. Instead of compromising the New Testament ethic, however, they took the alternative of withdrawing from the arena of direct action against corporate evil. The mystery of social unrighteousness was too deep and baffling for them to fathom. They felt called to adhere to the ideal of moral perfectionism and ethical absolutism as they understood the teachings of Jesus to require. The problem of dealing with the evil in society they left with God as the Creator and beneficent Ruler of the universe, content to busy themselves with those tasks which they believe God has directly enjoined upon them, and so influencing society at large by means that are seemingly indirect. They know that it is God's will that they should love their fellow men, do good to all as they have opportunity, and be Christ's witnesses to the gospel of salvation unto all nations. As they approximate the Christlike character they cannot fail to be a salt of the earth and a light to the world.

Whether God intends to save the world or is doing so is not a matter of immediate concern to these people. They want to do His will so far as they can know it for themselves, and the final outcome of history, they feel, can be safely left in God's hands. They know that all progress toward good and away from evil starts in the individual soul by an act of the individual will. At the same time, in looking back over the centuries of history they can see that Christ's gospel has accomplished more than merely saving individual souls out of the world of their time, and that it is certainly true that Christ and His teachings have influenced the moral and ethical ideals of society at large, that through His followers these teachings have changed society in some important respects, and even the world has today a conscience on many points of morals and ethics

which it did not have in the centuries past. Their feeling is that these changes are the long range working of God Himself through the lives of His people as they possess the saltness of Christian character and shed forth the light of Christian truth in indirect ways upon the world about them.

This whole matter seems to come back again to the fact which Jesus emphasized by His precept and example, that being is more important than doing, that character accomplishes more in God's work than activity. Not only has Christ influenced history, but one is impressed, in the last place, by the fact that the seer of the Apocalypse, when he saw God's cause finally triumphant over all opposition and evil, had a vision not of individual souls, but of a city, as it were, coming down from heaven. Now a city is above all else a community of people, a state where people live a common life together and work together. May not this teach us that there can and will be a righteous and holy society at some time? Human society is no more inherently and irredeemably immoral than the individual man himself. But to men it may appear more hopelessly evil because sin has mysterious ways of working itself out in group activities, ways which only God comprehends and only He can remedy. It is therefore God's work to save the world and society. The Christian's duty and task is to do the will of God as He has revealed this in His Word.

The people who have seriously endeavored not to compromise the ethical teachings of Christ in carrying out the instruction to do good to all and to influence the world of the great society, the state, and the community, have exerted themselves along different lines and in different ways. Some have gone far in the direction of direct actionism, others quite as far in the direction of complete isolation. Without approving or condemning their position, the Quakers or Society of Friends may be cited as an example of those who have sought to apply the New Testament ethic of love. But they have generally been activists in a direct way trying to mold and influence social, economic, and political forces in the direction of righteousness. At times in their history they have been very active politically, holding high political offices, while trying to work with as little use of violence and coercion as possible for the improvement of the community and state.

On the other extreme might be cited certain Mennonite or pietistic groups, such as the Hutterian Brethren, who have withdrawn as far as possible from contact with the civil community, so that they did not seem to be very active as a salt of the earth and a light of the world. Between these extremes the main body of Mennonites have stood, not on any hard and fast line of practice in details, but rather faithfully holding to the principle of working through the quiet influence of character and with as little direct action as possible for changing conditions in the surrounding community. All use of force or sanction of force or legal processes or police coercion for compelling people to do right has been abhorrent to them.

Some of these people abstain from all participation in governmental affairs, even from voting, as being inconsistent with the ethics of nonresistance. Others of them vote regularly at the polls in political elections, presumably as an expression of personal preference and without meaning to dictate how the government shall be conducted. Few take any part in political campaigns or hold public office, except in small communities and then chiefly such as are of an administrative nature. This line of practice would seem to be in keeping with the principle of adhering to the ethic of love, goodwill, service, doing good as members of the civil community.

There would seem to be little ground in the teachings of Jesus for such a degree of aloofness that would keep Christians from participating in the conduct of a local school district or other local community projects under ordinary conditions. Particularly when the citizens of a community are asked to express their wish or preference on some question affecting the moral life of the community, it would seem to be a losing of their saltness and an obscuring of their light to refuse to express their wish in a quiet orderly way. Just exactly where to draw the line on the matter of community and civic participation may be for the nonresistant Christian a difficult question. As the apostle Paul would probably say: Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind as to the detailed practice he thinks is right according to the teachings of Jesus and the apostles. Much will depend upon circumstances, upon the nature of the community, and upon the nature of the activity that is carried on.

One phase of Mennonite practice that approaches to the principle of direct, but non-political action against evils in society has

been the making of appeals to governments in the form of petition or protest. It is reported as a fact of history that the first formal protest against slavery in America was made by a small group of four men of whom one was a Mennonite, who in 1688 filed a written protest against slavery with the colonial Assembly of Pennsylvania. At different times petitions for recognition of Mennonite scruples against participation in war have been offered to government or its officials.

Direct political action and policy is generally a compromised action. A state or government does not always do what its officials regard as absolutely right and ethical. They do the best they can under the circumstances in order to meet the situations before them. Those who take an absolutist stand on the ethic of the New Testament therefore cannot participate in direct political action without compromising their obedience to the principles of Christ. By maintaining their witness with some degree of consistency they can continually serve as a kind of conscience for the civil society at large, provided they do not become saltless and lightless through an unnatural isolation from that society.

In summary it may be said that the Christian is a real member of the civil community or state, and that he owes obligations to that community in the support of paying taxes, contributing to the moral stability and elevation of the community through the influence of a good character and through acts of love and good will, and in giving encouragement to the forces of righteousness. At the same time his own moral and spiritual roots, the sources of his inner life, are not in the area of the civil community, from the evil phases of whose life he keeps himself separated sufficiently to constitute himself a salt and a light to it. And the all important consideration is that he views all his life and loyalty in the light of God Himself. God is the final and sole reality for him, and he fits the civil community into relation with this reality. God he believes is undoubtedly using the Christian's influence to change history, but that God really asks him to work only at changing the individual people whom he can reach; and further that God requires that some people uphold the absolutist ideal of love and New Testament nonresistance not only as their own response to God's standard but also as a continual challenge to the lower and compromised standards that prevail in most of civil society and the state.

The nonresistant Christian moreover strives for a humble attitude of heart and mind. While being sure that God calls him to apply the New Testament in the fullest sense he can and that this somehow contributes to the advancement of God's program for the world, still he does not judge other Christians whom, for all he knows, God may also be using toward accomplishing the same end. He is aware that he enjoys and profits by the liberty and freedom, the safety and security which other men have established through means which he could not himself employ, ends furthermore which he knows of no fully ethical way of establishing and maintaining. Therefore he is in a dilemma, but God still stands out as the great reality, and to God and His will he clings. He can well be very humble, and certainly self-righteousness and condemnation of others is entirely out of place on his part.

THE MENACE OF PROPAGANDA AND HOW TO MEET IT

MELVIN GINGERICH

Today, as perhaps never before, we live in a world of competing propagandas. Democrats and Republicans, communists and fascists, employers and employees, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., the wets and the drys, the militarists and the pacifists, the fundamentalists and the modernists, the isolationists and the collective security advocates, the free traders and the believers in national self-sufficiency, the democracies and the totalitarian states, are all using propaganda. We are exposed to it through the press, the radio, the movies, and from the speaker's platform. This is not to say that all of these groups are anti-social and are guilty of dishonest motives. A short time ago the American Association of School Administrators meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, stated that "propaganda could be either honest or dishonest, constructive or subversive according to its purposes and motives."

A propagandist is one who tries to get you to accept his point of view without giving you the opportunity to examine critically his philosophy or to listen to a presentation of a conflicting point of view. In fact, he will try to convince you that there is only one point of view and will attempt to keep you from hearing an opposing philosophy. He is determined to bring about a definite acceptance of his views or to bring about specific action in terms of his views. Again it should be stressed that in doing this the propagandist may be honest or dishonest, selfish or unselfish. The educators meeting at Cleveland viewed with genuine alarm the amount of dishonest and superficial propaganda now in circulation in the United States, "because so few citizens submit the pronouncements of propagandists to critical analysis." These men attributed the failure to be critical to deficiencies in the education of the people, and they expressed fear that the majority of voters might under the influence of propaganda support proposals of a destructive character. They agreed that one of the major problems of America's schools was to educate citizens to be less gullible.

As citizens of America we face this problem along with the rest

of the citizenry. Whether the criticism that our boys who were drafted during the World War were largely ignorant of world events was a justifiable criticism or not we need not decide at this point. We do know that the isolation of our rural communities has been pretty well shattered in the last two decades and that even Old Order Amish communities, without the automobiles, radios, and daily papers, are through the medium of the public schools receiving a broader picture of national and world affairs than they have ever had before. The writer wonders, however, if a state of ignorance of world affairs is not to be preferred to the condition in which people know so many "facts" that are not true. For example, if a government official would ask one of our boys the nationality of our president it would be much more preferable to have him say, "I don't know" than to say, "He is a Jew and his name should be Rosenfelt." Or if some one were to ask him what caused the World War, it would be better for him to confess ignorance than to say that the Jewish Protocols prove that the Jews planned and caused the war. But most of our people do have a partial knowledge of world affairs and many of them along with other American citizens have accepted as truth much propaganda that has come to them through the mail or from the speaker's platform.

Aside from the fact that the Christian should be characterized by his search of and zeal for truth, another element is involved in the propaganda issue which presents a specific problem to the follower of Christ. Most propaganda comes to us in a highly emotionalized form and is designed to cause us to act not from motives of logic or reason but as beings motivated by emotional forces. Propaganda breeds hate, fear, distrust, suspicion, jealousy, and intolerance. The writer well remembers how in his boyhood days he became a victim of the anti-Catholic propaganda contained in the publication known as *The Menace.* We who read this paper were convinced that nearly every Catholic church was a secret arsenal and that in a short time the Catholics could gain complete control of the government of the United States. Sad to say, a very pious Amish brother was the subscription agent for this paper in our community. A friend of mine says she remembers well when she as a young girl, influenced by such publications, was afraid to walk down the side of the street where Catholics lived. Although there is still some of this unreasonable, un-Christian prejudice against

Catholics, among American citizens and among our own members, other groups have been substituted to be America's whipping boy.

If it is conceded that the problem of propaganda is important enough to merit attention on this program, we may next proceed to examine the chief devices used by the propagandist. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis in 1937 described seven of these devices, and since that outline has been very generally followed by writers on our subject ever since that date, it will be well to study each device carefully.

First, there is the "Name Calling" device. Its purpose is to make us form a judgment without examining the evidence on which it should be based. The propagandist appeals to our hates and fears by giving bad names to those individuals, groups, programs, races, and nations which he would have us condemn or reject. The word "heretic" used to be a bad name, but today's bad names are fascist, dictator, Red, financial oligarchy, communist, muck-raker, alien, outside agitator, economic royalist, brain truster, pacifist, socialist, tory. Some of these terms are used by conservatives who wish to denounce those desiring changes, and some are used by radicals who wish to denounce those opposing change. Usually the propagandist does not define his terms or attempt to explain clearly why the term should be applied in the particular case. Politicians are prone to use this method. If they can blame their failures or the ills of the country upon some poorly defined group, they are able to avoid much explaining to their constituents. Those in leadership at Washington have made use of such terms as economic royalists, financial oligarchs, Wall Street, and big business. But perhaps the most over worked terms in America today are "Reds" and "communists". Propagandists know that the overwhelming majority of the American people have a middle class capitalist philosophy. They know that the American people have no sympathy for the communist philosophy and that it is easy to arouse their emotions of hatred and fear when these labels are pinned upon individuals. If they wish to defeat a program or an individual there is no better way than to call it or him a "Red" or a "communist". True, there are communists in the United States, and many of them are circulating their own propaganda and are attempting to gain important positions in labor unions and in other organizations. It has been estimated that there are 75,000 members of the Communist Party in

America, or at the most perhaps 100,000. That leaves 129,900,000 Americans who are not communists and most of them enemies of communism. In other words, for every communist there are 1,300 noncommunists. The city of Goshen's share would be eight communist for its 10,000 people. The writer doubts if any one can discover even six in this city. Keep these figures in mind the next time you listen to Father Coughlin's broadcast or the next time you pick up the *Defender* magazine.

America is in little danger from communism. If there is any immediate danger to America, it comes from the threat of fascism. *Propaganda Analysis,* which is exposing both communist and fascist schemes, tells us that there are some 800 organizations in America that can be considered pro-fascist or pro-nazi. *Life* magazine recently described their methods in these words: "Because real live communists are comparatively scarce outside Russia, Fascist propagandists feel impelled to supplement their bogey of communism with some more familiar and concrete 'menace'. By seizing on that traditional scapegoat, the 'International Jew', they add racial antagonism to radical hatred, and they compound the two by blaming communism on the Jews."

As one studies American history one sees that communism or anything resembling it has never made more than a feeble showing in the United States. The same cannot be said for the spirit of fascism. Witness the Know-Nothing movement, the Ku Klux Klan after the World War, and Mayor Hague in Jersey City. *Life* magazine in a clear statement recently showed the difference in the two threats: "But there is a profound difference which makes Fascism a far graver menace to America than communism. For communism is a frank proposal to change America's whole way of life by taking away every man's possessions and giving them to the State. With this alien ideal the Communist Party in America has in 20 years acquired 100,000 active members and some 129,900,000 enemies. But Fascism begins as a call to fearful men to unite to defend against clutching enemies not only their country but also their own personal possessions. Americans in the past have responded in multitudes to that call. In fear-ridden 1939 it now appears that an increasing number of them are yielding again."

It is this movement which we need to watch and fear. This movement, thriving upon intense nationalism, bred in fear, distrust, sus-

picion, hatred and intolerance, not only shouts "down with communism" but also "down with the Jews" and in time it may shout "down with pacifism" and our church will be marked for persecution. May God help us see this threat and may God protect our preachers and our writers from becoming the tools of this movement.

The January *Propaganda Analysis* contains a list of the publications that encourage the fascist philosophy. By way of explanation let me add that this publication is edited by a genuine lover of democracy, not a radical, but a member of the Republican political party. This January issue lists the Crusader White Shirts, *The American Guard,* the *National American Bulletin, World Service,* Knights of the White Camelia, and Winrod's *Revealer* as Fascist forces. The old paper, *The Menace,* has become *The Monitor,* and lately when its circulation began to drop it took up the cause of anti-Semitism, thus keeping company with Coughlin and Winrod. The *Liberation* runs a head line "Will It Take Civil War to End Jew Control?" *The Christian Free Press* declares, "Jewry Declares War, Christian Patriots are Ready." *The American Guard* calls upon the white people of America to unite. Winrod's *Revealer* explains "The sinister spirit which today animates the White House," by "scientific proof" of President Roosevelt's Jewish ancestry. When Winrod is not busy trying to prove Roosevelt is a Jew, he may be trying to prove the significance of the Jewish protocols, which have been proved over and over again to have been frauds, manufactured by anti-Jewish forces. Or again he may be trying to prove that the New Deal is a plot originally planned by Colonel House in a book of his having a title with a secret meaning. This fantastic story recently found its way into one of our Mennonite publications, the world news department of *The Christian Monitor.* One of these groups, the Silver Legion, however insists it is misunderstood. A Silver Legion leader stated recently, "as a matter of fact there is nowhere in our instruction that the killing of Jews is advocated."

Although the Name-Calling device is used perhaps most often, the second one, the use of Glittering Generalities is common, too. By it the propagandist identifies his program with virtue by use of "virtue words." He uses words like love, generosity, brotherhood, truth, freedom, honor, liberty, justice, the right to work, loyalty, progress, democracy, and the American way. These words call up

shining ideals in which most people believe, and the propagandist then tries to get us to accept his program by associating it with these ideals. He does not want us to examine evidence but rather he wants us to be in the emotional condition which will cause us to accept his program uncritically.

A third method is the Transfer Device by which a propagandist carries over the authority, sanction and prestige of something we respect and revere to something he would have us accept. We respect the cartoon of Uncle Sam and so the cartoonist will show Uncle Sam approving a law or a movement which he approves. The flag and the church are used in a similar way.

The Testimonial method is so common it needs little explanation. A senator endorses an advertised product or a preacher condemns a national policy. Because the individual speaking is important we are supposed to accept his opinions regardless of whether his training qualifies him to sit in judgment on this particular question or not.

The Plain Folks device is used by politicians, business men, ministers and others to gain our confidence by their appearing to be people like ourselves. These men attend country picnics, country churches, pitch hay, and go fishing, all to impress us with the fact that they are "just plain folks." A glance at the pictures of our politicians in an election year shows how much this is used.

The sixth device is known as Card Stacking. Here the propagandist deliberately attempts to deceive. He uses lies, distortion, omits facts, and uses overemphasis or underemphasis. This method is used extensively in war time as will be shown presently.

The last device is the Band Wagon. The theme is "Everybody's doing it." The propagandist hires parades, fills a great hall, employs music, and dramatics, and appeals to us en masse. He wants us to act as Protestants, as negroes, as farmers, or as teachers. "Vote for Mr. X and don't throw your vote away, he's sure to win," is a favorite technique of those using the Band Wagon device.

It was during the World War that the potentialities of propaganda were first fully realized. In the early years of the war both the Allies and the Central Powers competed for control over the American mind. Every possible attempt was made to convince the American of the righteousness of one side and the wickedness of the other. The German propagandists were not nearly as clever as were the English and before long the Americans were "swallowing

an over-dose of poison" from the Allied side. A vast amount of newspaper material found its way into our daily and weekly papers by the way of the London war office, but we never suspected that it was "doctored" news. The Germans were at a great disadvantage because the cables from their country to ours were cut, and we received practically no news direct from their side. We were told an endless number of deliberate lies by the English propagandists, most of them being atrocity stories. These stories were so widely circulated that even now there are still some Americans who believe that the German soldiers cut off the hands of Belgian children.

"But no campaign to manage the minds of large groups of people in behalf of a cause excelled that of the United States once it had entered the conflict," states H. L. Childs of Princeton. A study of the cartoon posters used to urge enlistment or to sell Liberty Bonds shows how practically every device of the propagandist was used by our government. Calling the enemy and those who did not approve the war bad names, demanding unquestioning service by using the virtue words "honor," "patriotism," and similar ones, the use of the Transfer Device by using pictures of women, children, and the church, are only a few illustrations from a long list that you will recognize readily.

Billboards, the movies, hand bills, the radio, all lend themselves readily to the devices of the propagandist. Each of these merits our attention, but it will be necessary to limit this discussion to a study of the press. The charges that are brought are however not to be considered as a wholesale indictment of the American press. The speaker believes that the American press is the best and the most free of propaganda of any in the world today. That does not mean our press is perfect. Far from it, as we shall see.

The press is guilty of Name Calling. When certain great dailies in America began calling the Loyalist government of Spain "the Red government," the writer believes that they were using propaganda. When the papers began calling the Reorganization Bill "the Dictator Bill," and when they referred to the president's attempts to defeat those who had voted against him as a "purge," they were guilty of using a tool of the propagandist.

On the other hand those liberal dailies that referred to the panic of 1929 as "the Hoover Depression" were likewise unfair and were using propaganda. Secretary Ickes charges that the press has given

practically no publicity to the findings of research laboratories on the subject of the effect of cigarette smoking upon health and length of life. We would not expect them to do it considering how much revenue they obtain from tobacco advertisers. Perhaps no advertising outside of tobacco and liquor is as dishonest as patent medicine advertising. The press derives a great revenue from this source. That very likely was one reason why it fought valiantly against the Tugwell pure food and drug act. Although the government is constantly indicting patent medicine firms for their dishonesty, hardly ever does an account of these successful prosecutions make the daily papers. Since the subject of patent medicine advertising is before us now, it might be well to throw in at this point the thought that some of us feel that there should be a more careful supervision to prevent this type of advertising finding its way into our church publications.

Because our great newspapers represent great aggregations of capital, one may rightly classify them as big business. Newspaper policy then represents in general the philosophy of the rich business man. Because that is true it is difficult to get through the daily press unprejudiced stories of labor troubles. Nearly always the labor union does not get a fair presentation of its case. This at least is the impression the writer has after comparing the newspaper reports of strikes with the reports of the Senate committee investigating civil liberties.

There are a few rules to keep in mind in reading the press. First to remember is the tyranny of the headlines. It often happens that the head line represents the wishful thinking of the news editor and not the real content of the article. Because so many people are only head line readers, the editors know they can influence many people by the use of subtle headlines. By careful reading, one can soon spot these papers. Another question to ask is, What are the views and what is the philosophy of the dominant social group in which an editor finds himself? Does the paper carry articles on the front page headed by the name of an editorial writer? If it does, the chances are that this article is propaganda. The best papers reserve the editorial page for this type of articles. This page is the page of opinion and when signed articles appear here, everyone knows that the article represents opinion more than news.

In evaluating news, one should know something of the news gath-

ering agencies. The "A. P." is on the whole quite fair and objective, but it is considered by some to lean towards the conservative business man's point of view. The "U. P." was long regarded as having a liberal social and economic philosophy, but of late years its liberalism has been tempered. The "I. N. S." is Hearst owned and in the words of Professor Casey of Minnesota University is "guilty of jingoism, coloration, and distortion."

Just a word about foreign news. Among the questions one should ask while evaluating foreign news is this one, Does this piece of news come directly from the scene of the happening? Another one, Has the event been witnessed by the reporter who reports it, and does he have a reliable reputation? Even if a foreign correspondent is honest, he soon discovers that unless he makes himself agreeable to the party in power in the foreign capital, he will have difficulty in getting a scoop on the news. In a short time he may become part of the social set of this foreign city and unconsciously present its prejudices and its philosophy.

Before closing this paper, we must come back more definitely to the Christian implications of the subject of propaganda. We have pointed out that the Christian must love and honor truth and that propaganda feeds upon hate, fear, suspicion, and intolerance. We must admit that even most religious groups have been guilty at times of the use of unethical propaganda. Liberal religious groups have used propaganda against the conservatives. Perhaps no where is this fact proved better than in John Horsch's book, *Modern Religious Liberalism*. But it will not be as profitable for us this afternoon to point out the sins of the opposition as it will be to note our own short comings.

The writer has been very much disturbed by the way in which conservative writers in religious periodicals have attempted to pin the badge of communism upon so many with whom they can't agree. For instance, in one of our own church papers, John L. Lewis has been called a communist. However much we may dislike John L. Lewis' methods, his ideas, and his personality, let us be honest, fair, and truthful and admit he is not a communist and never was. Let us not be guilty of name calling. We may never know how much harm we are doing by using this unfair device. The writer regularly reads the conservative fundamentalist paper *Christian Faith and Life* and has received much help from it. He appreciates its ringing

defense of the Christian faith. But in many issues there are unfair and propagandistic attacks upon those holding differing views. In the January issue, there is an attack upon the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Many of the charges no doubt are justified, but general charges are made and name calling is used. One charge is "They align themselves with the Internationals." Just what does "Internationals" mean? It evidently is to be considered a bad name, but they do not explain clearly. Under that heading, however, they say, "as if it were not enough to assent to the Moscow idea of First, Second, Third, and Fourth Internationals, they have now absolutely arranged to subject Christianity itself to the same international expression, a meeting being actually arranged for the summer of 1938 in Holland with a view to the formation of a World Council of Churches." It seems to me there can be but one conclusion. The author wishes to infer that the Federal Council is a tool of the Moscow government. When this story made its way into a Mennonite publication, *The Christian Monitor,* the charge was changed slightly and the Federal Council was accused of "flirting with communism." Below this charge there were two items, evidently considered to be a substantiation of the charge. One item was a quotation from the Naval Intelligence report charging the Council as being pacifist and radical. Since when does being pacifist make one a communist? Certainly the Russian Reds and the Marxists are not pacifists. And what is meant by being "radical"? The second item referred to a quotation from Mrs. Dilling's *Red Network,* in which she said that a sex pamphlet distributed by the Council had ideas in it that might have come out of Russia. What does that prove? And why quote Mrs. Dilling, who considers every pacifist organization, the Y. M. C. A., most church conference committees dealing with social and international problems, as dangerous and un-American. A woman who lists the president's wife, most of his cabinet, many of the honored members of our Senate, great college presidents, leading bishops, and church leaders, and many others of America's most noted citizens as dangerous characters that should not be given the chance to speak to American audiences is certainly not the type of person to use as authority.

What about the charge that the leaders of the Council are communists? First, what is a communist? Do the critics mean, Marxian revolutionists, who make atheism a test of membership, or do they

mean some one who happens to wonder about the righteousness of a system that condones people living in unbelievable luxury and riches when their neighbors a block away are starving to death? Do they forget that the early church practiced a form of communism? Do they know that in Iowa in the Amana colonies we had a group who for almost one hundred years lived under a system of Christian communism? Do they know that the Hutterites have practiced Christian communism for 400 years?

Do some of these conservative writers really believe their charge that Reinhold Niebuhr, Kirby Page, Harry Ward and Bishop McConnell, the four they mentioned when they were called upon to name names, are really infected with bolshevistic communism? Niebuhr says, "as a Christian I repudiate not only the atheism of communism but the fanaticism which I believe to be the product of its too shallow interpretation of life." Kirby Page spends most of his time opposing the use of violence, which is the method of communistic bolshevism. Professor Ward has again and again denounced violent revolution and the use of force. Bishop McConnell says, "I am constantly speaking and debating against communism."

I am not interested in defending these men or their views, but only in distinguishing truth from propaganda.

In conclusion let me say that this paper has attempted to do two things. In the first place, an attempt was made to point out the nature of propaganda, so that we can more readily detect it. We have an obligation not to think evil of people, we have an obligation to seek the truth, and we should be an example to the world of a people who form sane judgments based upon genuine evidence. We should learn to demand facts and proof. Articles designed to help our people reach these goals should appear regularly in our church papers. Emphasis should be placed upon propaganda analysis in the class rooms of our church schools. A number of interesting courses on propaganda analysis are being introduced into our public school curriculums. Of course, a strong background in history and social science is an excellent preparation to guard one against becoming the victim of propaganda. The writer has been surprised to find that among those in our different communities who have become Winrod disciples were people who have attended our church schools. But in no case have these individuals been history or so-

cial science majors. Perhaps more hours in these fields should be required of our students.

The second thing that this paper has attempted to do is to warn us who naturally sympathize with the conservative and fundamentalist cause to be fair to those who hold opposing views. Let us not be guilty of the name calling device of the propagandist. If a man is really a fascist, or a communist, or a militarist we may call him that if we define the term we use and then offer specific proof to substantiate our charge. But we must be exceedingly careful of the statements that find their way into our church papers. We should be especially careful in commenting upon political, national, and international issues. As a nonresistant group, we dare not unnecessarily offend others by careless, unfair, or prejudiced statements. When we quote we should use quotation marks and name our authorities. The time has come when all news items or articles dealing with world problems which are prepared for our church papers should either be written by or edited by some one who has not only a thorough faith in Christ's doctrine of love and good will to all mankind but who also has a thorough training in the fields of propaganda analysis and in social science and history.

The writer has on a number of occasions expressed the ideas contained in the above paragraph to those in authority at the Mennonite Publishing House. But after having given what he considers to be constructive suggestions, the writer will be the first to admit the difficulty of completely reaching these ideals, and will not be surprised to hear that even this paper may not be altogether free of prejudice, even though he has done his best to be objective and impartial.

NONRESISTANCE AND INDUSTRIAL CONFLICT

Guy Franklin Hershberger

From the beginning of their history the Mennonite people have given much thought to the Biblical doctrine of nonresistance as applied to the personal life of the individual, to ordinary litigation, to the magistracy, and to international warfare. It is only in recent years, however, that the American Mennonites at least, have given serious thought to the application of this principle in the field of industrial relations. The reason for this is obvious. Until two generations ago industrial conflict, as we know it today, was virtually non-existent in the United States. And only within the present generation has it affected the Mennonite church in a direct way.

For more than two centuries, American life was largely rural. The majority of people were agriculturalists, and there was always an abundance of land awaiting the farmer's plow. This abundance of land helped to make the average American self-reliant, independent, and free from those restraints and maladjustments which characterize an industrial civilization with its crushing poverty, its unemployment and its struggle for a living wage and decent working conditions. The newly arrived immigrant might work in the employ of another for a brief period of time. But sooner or later, unless he was offered exceptional wages, he would likely remove himself to the western edge of settlement and take up land for himself. In this way even the poorest indentured servant, within ten years after his arrival and sale by the ship captain, might become an owner of land, free to chart his own career, a lord of the soil.

Possibly no one has given us a better description of American life in the earlier period than that written in the eighteenth century by Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, the French-American gentleman farmer, in his *Letters from an American Farmer.* Here, says Crevecoeur, "the rich and the poor are not so far removed from each other as they are in Europe . . . . We are all tillers of the earth . . . a people of cultivators . . . all respecting the laws, without dreading their power, because they are equitable. We are all animated by the spirit of an industry which is unfettered and unre-

strained, because each person works for himself . . . . We have no princes for whom we toil, starve, and bleed; we are the most perfect society now existing in the world. Here man is free as he ought to be; nor is this pleasing equality so transitory as many others are. Many ages will not see the shores of our great lakes replenished with inland nations, nor the unknown bounds of North America entirely peopled. Who can tell how far it extends? Who can tell the millions of men whom it will feed and contain? for no European foot has as yet travelled half the extent of this mighty continent . . . . In this great American asylum, the poor of Europe have by some means met together . . . . [Here] everything has tended to regenerate them; new laws, a new mode of living, a new social system; here they are become men: in Europe they were as so many useless plants, wanting vegetative mould, and refreshing showers; they withered, and were mowed down by want, hunger, and war; but now by the power of transplantation, like all other plants they have taken root and flourished!"[1]

More than one observer in the eighteenth century believed that the health and prosperity of American civilization depended upon the continuation of this simple, agricultural life. Perhaps no one believed it more strongly than did Thomas Jefferson the democratic farmer president of the United States. Jefferson was vigorously opposed to the growth of industrialism. He believed that the independent farmer was the backbone of every healthy society. He feared the captain of industry and the working class proletariat alike: "Those who labor in the earth," said Jefferson, "are the chosen people of God . . . whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue . . . . Corruption of morals in the mass of cultivators is a phenomenon of which no age nor nation has furnished an example . . . . Generally speaking, the proportion which the aggregate of the other classes of citizens bears in any state to that of its husbandmen, is the proportion of its unsound to its healthy parts, and is a good enough barometer whereby to measure its degree of corruption. While we have land to labor then, let us never wish to see our citizens occupied at a work-bench, or twirling a distaff . . . for the general operations of manufacture, let our workshops remain in Europe. It is better to carry provisions

1. J. Hector St. John de Crevecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer* (Everyman's Library edition, Dutton and Co.), pp. 40-42.

and materials to workmen there, than bring them to the provisions and materials, and with them their manners and principles . . . . The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government, as sores do to the strength of the human body. It is the manners and spirit of a people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy in these is a canker which soon eats to the heart of its laws and constitution."[2]

With keen insight did Thomas Jefferson perceive the evils inherent in an industrialized society. And he seems to have hoped that America might remain free of them forever. But today we are all aware that his hopes for the future of American civilization were not to be realized. For it is a far cry from the simple agrarian society of Crevecoeur and of Jefferson to the highly industrialized and centralized economic order of today, typified by the life of Gary, of Detroit, of Youngstown, or of Pittsburgh. When Jefferson became president of the United States in 1801, he was responsible for the political welfare of approximately 5,000,000 people, the great majority of whom lived on the farm as he did himself. New York and Philadelphia were then a little more than one-half as large as South Bend, Indiana, is today, and Boston[3] was somewhat smaller than Elkhart. But in the next hundred years tremendous changes took place. By 1850 the total population of the United States had reached 23,000,000 and New York city[4] was almost as large as Pittsburgh is today. By 1900 the total population of the country had reached 75,000,000, more than three times the number fifty years earlier.

But the most significant development of this fifty year period was the tremendous growth of the American city. In 1850, Chicago was still a small city. But by 1880 its population had reached a half million and by 1890 it was over a million. By 1880 one-half of the population in the North Atlantic states was living in towns of 4000 or more inhabitants and even in the middle west the proportion was one out of five. And by 1890 one-third of the total American population were dwellers in cities of 4000 or larger. In New York and Connecticut the proportion had now reached two-thirds, in Massa-

2. Quoted from V. L. Parrington, *The Colonial Mind,* p. 347.

3. The figures for 1800 are: New York, 60,489; Philadelphia, 69,403; Boston, 24,937.

4. In 1850 the population of New York was 515,547.

chusetts four-fifths, and in Rhode Island nine-tenths of the total. In this era there was a steady movement from the farm to the city. During the 1880's more than 1000 farms were abandoned in Vermont. In New Hampshire there were 1300; in Massachusetts there were 1500; and in Maine, 3300, abandoned farms in a period of ten years.[5]

The question now arises: Why did the American people in such large numbers abandon their farms, which, according to Crevecoeur and Jefferson, were the source of their happiness, to take up life in the congested city? The answer is that the economic forces of the nation were now focused in the city and not in the country. Here were vast accumulations of capital, of business and of financial institutions. In the cities there had grown up thousands of smoking mills and factories demanding the labor of those emigrants from country to city who were to constitute the new society of industrial workers. These mills and factories now became the great producers of the nation's wealth. From 1850 to 1890 the population in the United States was multiplied almost three times. But in this same period manufacturing was multiplied nineteen times in investment, and twelve times in production. Until 1890 the value of agricultural products in the United States still exceeded the value of manufactured products. But in that year manufactures assumed the lead. In 1860 the United States stood in fourth place among the industrial nations of the world. But from 1890 on she occupied first place.

Accompanying this marvelous growth in the nation's business there was another important development. This was the centralization and consolidation of numerous small industries into great industrial corporations which constituted what now came to be known as big business. In the early days of their history even railroads were small affairs connecting two towns located but a short distance from each other. Shem Zook, the enterprising Amish Mennonite, builder and proprietor of the small railway which I understand still operates between Belleville and Reedsville, Pennsylvania, was not an isolated exception. There were hundreds of such railroads in all parts of the country. Before 1870, to ship a cargo of freight from Albany to Buffalo, a distance of approximately 300 miles, meant the patronage of eleven railroads, eleven loadings and

5. Cf. A. M. Schlesinger, *The Rise of the City* (New York, 1933), ch. 3.

unloadings, dealing with eleven independent companies. But following 1870 there was a period of rapid consolidation. Cornelius Vanderbilt, taking these eleven roads and scores of others like them, forged them all together into one great New York Central railway system, which today runs its Twentieth Century Limited from New York to Chicago in sixteen hours. Likewise John D. Rockefeller merged some 250 small oil companies operating in the Cleveland-Pittsburgh area into one great Standard Oil Company which by 1890 controlled ninety percent of the nation's petroleum business. And Andrew Carnegie and Charles M. Schwab brought together a host of little steel refineries to form one great United States Steel Corporation, producing one-half of the nation's steel and employing in 1900 something like 168,000 men.

The organization of industry on this large scale had certain advantages. It made possible the purchase of raw materials in larger quantities and at a lower price. It made possible the utilization of waste, a saving in the selling organization and other savings which might conceivably bring benefits to the consumer in an abundance of goods at lower prices. But this large scale organization also had certain disadvantages. When Rockefeller controlled nine-tenths of the nation's oil business he had a monopoly of the sales. Charles M. Schwab likewise had a virtual monopoly of the steel business, with power to make enormous profits at the expense of a helpless consumer public. But no doubt the most dangerous power wielded by the Rockefellers, the Schwabs, and the other lords of creation, as Frederick Lewis Allen[6] calls them, was the power to control the destiny of hundreds of thousands of working men. When the United States Steel Corporation was organized in 1900, the fate of 168,000 workers and their families was placed into the hands of a single corporation. Such mass control of the working man was bound to bring evil results.

The laborer on the farm worked side by side with his employer. He knew him personally. He called him by his first name. He slept in his master's house and ate at his table. Employer and employee were friends and the chances were good that the latter would receive a square deal. This was likewise true, in a measure at least, in the field of industry in the earlier period, when factories were

6. Frederick Lewis Allen, *The Lords of Creation,* New York, 1935.

small and before the industrial employees had developed any considerable class consciousness. Under these circumstances, if the employee was dissatisfied with his working conditions it was a relatively easy matter to leave his old employer and attach himself to a new one willing to agree to the terms which the employee desired. The employee was a free man, capable of bargaining on a basis of relative equality with his employer. And, if he was unable to make the bargain he desired, he still had the opportunity of taking up land and cultivating a farm for himself where he could enjoy all that freedom and liberty so highly praised by Crevecoeur and Jefferson.

But by 1890 a great change had taken place. The industrial laborer of the city was no longer a free man. The American frontier was closed. The best farming land was occupied, so no matter how unsatisfactory his lot in the city he could not turn to the freedom of the farm as his father might have done. And when he turned to his employer, he found he could no longer bargain on a basis of equality, for his employer was a great impersonal, soulless corporation which stated the terms which he might accept or reject as he chose. If he accepted, the wages and the working conditions might be intolerable. But if he refused, there was starvation awaiting himself and his family. So he accepted. The corporations regarded labor as a commodity subject to the law of supply and demand. They freely spoke of the labor market as one would speak of the rubber market or the sugar market. When the demand was high, laborers were added to the pay roll. But when the demand was low they were taken off. This was evidently the thing to do if the business was to continue bringing high profits into its treasury. But in the meantime what would happen to the man who was laid off? And what of his wife and children? There was no avenue of escape. The farming frontier was closed. Industry had no jobs for him. He must wait until business picked up again. Then, maybe, he could earn something again.

Conditions in the United States may never have been as serious as in England where it was necessary to enact a law in 1842 forbidding the labor of boys under ten years, and of all women and girls, in coal mines where women had been creeping along on hands and knees drawing little cars of coal behind them. And where a law of 1833 limited the working day for children from nine to thirteen years of age to nine hours. But we realize that conditions were bad

enough even in the United States when we recall that in the 1830's there were 20,000 women in our eastern cities employed in factories at wages of $1.25 per week or less. Wages in shoe factories ranged from ten cents to fifty cents per day. And in 1870 there were 115,000 children, ten to fifteen years of age, working in factories whose owners declined to employ adult men in their place because it would cost them more money. Even as late as 1932 a popular American magazine carried the story of a worker in the Yale Dress Shop, one of Connecticut's notorious needle trade sweat shops, who received a check of less than two dollars for two weeks of hard work.

This picture constitutes the setting of the organized labor movement. And this picture must be retained in the mind's eye if the labor movement and modern industrial conflict are to be understood and treated fairly. Under these circumstances what was the laboring man who had lost his freedom and his bargaining power going to do? In all the industrial nations, in Europe and America, the answer was the same: Organization to restore the balance of bargaining power. In America the organizations took the form of trade unions. At the middle of the century they began to take form. The type setters, the machinists, the cigar makers, the coopers, the iron puddlers, the locomotive engineers, all had their separate unions. And then in 1881 most of these and many other trade unions were federated together in a large Federation of Trade Unions, later known as the American Federation of Labor. As a rule the demands of these organizations were not unreasonable. In 1886 the A. F. of L. drew up a platform asking for an eight hour working day, the prohibition of child labor (under fourteen years of age), universal compulsory education, the establishment of a national bureau of labor statistics, and adequate protection against injuries received in factories. The request for the prohibition of Chinese immigration may possibly be placed on a lower level. But even here there is no doubt that cheap Chinese labor did militate against a living wage for many American laborers.

The organized labor movement however, did not grow so very rapidly. In 1900 only about one-tenth of the American laborers were affiliated with the A. F. of L. And in 1934 the wage earning class numbered about 28,000,000, about one-seventh of whom were affiliated with the A. F. of L. There were of course a number of independent unions, particularly the strong railway brotherhoods

who were not affiliated with the A. F. of L. But even so, probably less than twenty per cent of the wage earners of America were unionized in 1934, a situation quite different from that found in the industrial countries of Europe. In 1934 the United States had stood first in the world's list of industrial nations for more than forty years. But in the list of organized labor she remained in sixteenth place.[7]

This difference between American labor and that of Europe is to be explained by the differences in their general economic structure. Until 1929 at least, much of what Crevecoeur had said in the eighteenth century was still true. Despite his many grievances, the American laborer, even, was a much freer man than the European laborer. The opportunities here were still much greater than there. Hence unionization was not as widespread in America as in Europe. Here was a quantitative difference between American and European labor organization.

But in addition to this there was also a qualitative difference between the two systems of labor. In Europe as a rule the entire working class, skilled and unskilled, was organized and motivated by a more or less definite class consciousness. In America only the skilled laborers were unionized, and there was a distinct absence of class consciousness among the working men. The skilled laborers in the trade unions had no case against capitalism as such. In fact they were potential capitalists themselves. The worker considered himself no different from his boss except that he had less money. And he hoped some day to be a boss himself. And then he would have more money too. So he did not care to organize himself as a "laborer" in the European sense. In many cases he even preferred a "company union" which was a sort of co-operative enterprise in which employer and employees sat around the same table, discussing their mutual problems. And this very arrangement often provided the avenue by which the employee climbed from the ranks of labor into the capitalist class, sometimes actually becoming president of the corporation itself.

As long as this condition prevailed in the American laboring world, industrial conflict was not a serious problem for a nonresistant people like the Mennonites. The great majority of them

7. George E. Sokolsky, *Labor's Fight for Power*, ch. 1.

lived on the farm anyway. Those who did live in the city could find employment where they would not be asked to join a union. The non-union job might not always be the most desirable one, but it could at least be found.

During the past ten years, however, the situation has changed considerably. Since the great depression of 1929, American labor conditions are no longer what they were before that time. To the 28,000,000 wage earners of 1934 mentioned earlier must be added another 10,000,000 or more would-be wage earners, who have no jobs. This means that almost one-fourth of American labor is unemployed. In addition, the prospects of rising from the ranks of labor to the position of manager and employer are not what they one time were, and the result is that American labor for the first time is growing class conscious. The Committee for Industrial Organization is making a desperate effort to break up the old trade unions with their capitalistic, middle class outlook, and merge all the workers, skilled and unskilled, of a given industry into one great union of laborers, whose members are class conscious, thinking of themselves as laborers, and motivated by the one great objective of waging a triumphant fight against their industrial overlords. Apparently the leadership of this movement is determined to pursue the fight relentlessly until the entire working class is organized solidly for the achievement of its ends. And due to this new turn of events it may be said that the nonresistant churches of America are facing the challenge of industrial conflict in a really serious way for the first time. Many of our Mennonite people are now in the cities and do not find it easy to return to the farm. If they are classed as industrial laborers, sooner or later they are likely to be caught by the dragnet of unionization and class struggle. And then what shall they and the church do?

We must hasten at this point to examine the fundamental principles underlying the class struggle and the industrial conflict. Precisely what is it in this situation that is out of harmony with the Scriptural principle of nonresistance? Briefly stated it is this: The industrial conflict is a fight for power with which to achieve social justice, whereas Biblical nonresistance enjoins submission even to injustice rather than engage in conflict. And these two principles are diametrically opposed to each other. They are mutually exclusive.

This struggle for economic power is one of the most serious social problems confronting the United States today. And it is important to remember that it is a struggle for power. The present immediate conflict is not concerned primarily with wages and hours, and sharing of profits. It is primarily concerned with power. The great objective of the C. I. O. and a growing number of class conscious American workers is to obtain a position of dominance—a position hitherto held by the industrial overlords. The recent strike at the Hettrick Manufacturing Company in Goshen was not initiated by the general will of those residents of Goshen who happen to be employed there. It is even possible that the majority of these workers were reasonably well satisfied with their wages and working conditions. But the strike was initiated by the labor leaders in the Hettrick plant at Toledo where a strike had been in progress for some time. And the strikes in both plants were ultimately sponsored and promoted by the T. W. O. C. and its officials in New York city and elsewhere whose primary concern is the complete organization of all textile workers in America for the purpose of dominating the textile industry. The immediate issue in the Hettrick strike was not hours and wages, but the power of organization.

Now, before criticizing the leaders of the C. I. O. too severely let us look at the situation from their point of view. Their ultimate objective is economic and social justice for the working man as they understand it. This will mean concessions by their employers and they believe it is impossible to obtain these concessions without first obtaining a measure of economic, social, and political power, with which to coerce their overlords. And in this view they are undoubtedly correct. I am frank to say that at this point I am somewhat of a follower of Reinhold Niebuhr who tells us that "all social co-operation on a larger scale than the most intimate social group requires a measure of coercion."[8] By this he means to say that a farmer and a hired man or two who know each other intimately can work together in a manner that is satisfactory to all parties concerned without resorting to coercion. Or a factory operator, employing a small number of workers with whom he maintains close personal relations, may do likewise. Or a community organization which is closely knit together by religious ties can

8. Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (New York, 1932), p. 3.

work together without industrial conflict or coercive measures. In other words, in the good old days of Crevecoeur and Jefferson when everyone, to use a Biblical figure, sat under his own vine and fig tree, worked and played with his neighbors on occasion, and worshipped with them on Sunday, knowing each person intimately and calling him by his first name, it was possible to maintain a happy, contented community life, where things ran smoothly enough. But under our present industrial system, Niebuhr means to say, with its large scale operations, its monopolistic organization, and its mass employment of thousands of workers by impersonal, soulless corporations, it is virtually impossible for the workers to obtain the concessions which they believe essential for their welfare without organized power with which to coerce their powerful overlords. The great industrialist is himself a man of power, and the power which he wields is in itself an invitation to conflict. It enables him to accrue profits beyond his rightful share. It makes him a sort of beast of prey. And sooner or later he finds some one who is ready to fight back, because he believes justice can not be obtained in any other way. Experience seems to show that important economic and social changes are seldom brought about without first a development of power which has its roots in the self interest of one class or another. To be sure, this coercive power need not always end in bloodshed. Through remedial legislation, and education and the inspiration of various types of idealism, the conflict may be softened and mitigated, and it often is. And all efforts along this line ought to be encouraged by every citizen and Christian. But we need to remember that with all these efforts the conflict cannot be abolished. So it is hopeless to expect our present large scale economic civilization to eliminate the element of conflict.

But now, having examined the struggle for power from the viewpoint of organized labor, and having granted that it cannot be eliminated, let us consider the attitude which the believer in Biblical nonresistance ought to take towards it. One might come to the point abruptly and declare, in an *ex cathedra* manner, that nonresistant people can have nothing to do with the struggle for power and leave it at that. The only difficulty with this procedure is that having left the problem at that point it soon becomes clear that it will not remain where it was put. For even if nonresistant people can have nothing to do *with* industrial conflict and the struggle for

power it is clear that sooner or later they will have to do something *about* it. This fact is so real that some may already have compromised on the issue. And it has been argued, by some religious pacifists, at least, if not by Biblical nonresistants, that the organized labor movement is Christian in its character and that the methods used in the struggle for power are often such as Jesus Himself would approve. And it is very true that often the methods of organized labor appear peaceful enough. Trade agreements are an example. The union makes an agreement with the company regarding wages, hours, seniority, and a score of matters. Such an agreement can be made, and often is made, in a peaceful manner without a show of conflict. Then when disputes do arise, the union and company sometimes make a settlement by arbitration which is also a peaceful method.

Sooner or later, however, if the dispute cannot be settled otherwise, the union calls a strike. Even this is sometimes called a peaceful method of settlement. The sit down strikers committed no violence. They just sat down peacefully beside their machines and told their boss they would stay there until he came across. Even the law permits peaceful picketing—and I suppose rightly so. The man on the picket line stands there in a peaceful manner telling the public by word of mouth and by the banners he carries that his employer is unjust. And the employer himself is thereby warned that he must submit to labor's demands, or run the risk of serious consequences. And then there is the boycott, equally peaceful, and effective. A recent issue of a labor periodical published in South Bend, Indiana, describes a boycott of the automotive workers against the Mid-Continent Petroleum Company. The unions simply decreed that workers should peacefully abstain from buying D-X gasoline and the account says the results were highly effective, sales at D-X stations being reduced by a large percentage.[9] At their best these methods constitute what is known as non-violent coercion. It is the method which Gandhi uses when he and his followers refuse to pay the salt tax, or fall down in the path of a marching British army to obstruct its progress. A careful examination, however, soon reveals the fact that even if this is non-violent coercion, it is coercion nevertheless. Its motive is not love for the enemy. Its aim is to

9. *The Labor News,* March 17, 1939.

humiliate the enemy, to obstruct his program, to destroy his business, to starve him, to make him unpopular, or by whatever method possible to coerce him into submission—to make him do you good. This may be non-violent coercion, but it is certainly not nonresistance. When Jesus said, "Love your enemies," He did not mean by this: love your enemies to make them do you good. What He did mean was: love your enemies because that is God's will. Your enemy may never do you good, whatever you do, but you must love him any way. The Christian's business is to obey the will of God. Whether doing so results in pleasure or in pain does not matter.

It should be clear by now that there is no difference in principle between so-called non-violent coercion and actual violence. There may be no bloodshed, of course. But the spirit, the aim, and purpose are the same. And always there are losses in property values. The boycott of D-X gasoline in South Bend did not result in the burning of any filling stations nor in personal assaults upon any of the attendants. But it did cut down their sales and commissions. And who knows how many babies had their milk supply cut short because Daddy wasn't able to sell as much gasoline as usual? Look at it any way one will, all the methods of so-called non-violent coercion are fundamentally the same as violent coercion and frequently result in physical suffering. In addition to this it should be remembered that sometimes the leaders lose control of the peaceful strike and then actual violence often results. A mob is formed. It marches upon the company's property. Valuable machinery is destroyed. Then troops are called in, and sometimes a battle follows. Scenes such as these are repulsive to the nonresistant Christian. But they should at least serve to remind him of the true character of the so-called non-violent methods of coercion in labor's struggle for power.

Now when we turn from the labor unions and direct our attention to the employers on the other side of this struggle for power, we find them just as skillful in the use of peaceful coercion as the employees, and just as ready to resort to brutal violence if the occasion seems to require it. Possibly the first thing the employer will do is to join a manufacturers' association, an organization which brings many manufacturers together in a peaceful manner to consider ways and means of fighting the labor unions. Then in the lockout the employer has a method very much like the peaceful strike. He peacefully locks his doors and lets the men who desire to work

stand outside or go home while he "makes repairs" on the inside. If he keeps the doors closed long enough, his troublesome employees may gradually drift away and then he can employ new men at his own price. If some of these men had been especially troublesome from his point of view he may put their names on a blacklist and peacefully circulate it among his fellow employers in the manufacturers' association. And if this job is done well he may succeed in keeping these men from ever getting a job in a factory again. If the employer has occasion to suspect dissatisfaction or disloyalty within his factory he may employ a detective agency to provide him with labor spies to circulate peacefully about the plant in the guise of employees, with eyes and ears open for such useful information as they may be able to gather for the boss. If a labor union is in process of organization the spies will promptly get in on the game. One of them may succeed in having himself elected secretary of the union where he will have custody of the records for the benefit of his employer. And then finally if the results of these peaceful methods seem to warrant it, the employer, like the labor union, may resort to actual violence. To illustrate what is meant, the records of the La Follette civil liberties committee for the investigation of employers' methods of coercion show that from 1933 to 1936 the General Motors Corporation invested over $1,000,000 in espionage and munitions. The Chrysler company spent over $275,000 for the same kind of service which is euphemistically called "protective engineering."[10] It seems that the detective agencies and the munitions interests work in rather close co-operation in this business. The spies report to the detective agencies and the detective agencies to the munitions company. Then a salesman of the munitions company approaches the local sheriff and chief of police with the information that a serious strike is in preparation and the advice to lay in a store of ammunition. If this effort is successful the salesman then approaches the employer with the information that the police department, having its ear to the ground, has reasons to expect trouble and so has prepared itself for the emergency. This being the case, the employer himself would do well to lay in a store of munitions also for private use. And so, in a short time the munitions firm receives a handsome order which is promptly shipped under a ficti-

10. Cf. E. T. Buehrer, "Class War in America", *The Christian Century,* (April 27, 1938), 55:527.

tious name or in some other fraudulent manner, but which nevertheless reaches the said employer in due time. The following extracts from the La Follette committee's reports will illustrate the point.

On one occasion the sales director of the Lake Erie Chemical company received the following letter:[11]

> Ship to J. V. M. . . . chief of police, city of Flint, Flint, Michigan, the following: Ten No. 16 gun clubs; and ten dozen (120) No. 16-A shells for same. These are to be shipped by express today, in accordance with my talk with Major S . . . .
>
> Do not bill the city of Flint for this material. Instead send the bill to the Manufacturers Association . . . . Mail it for the attention of Mr. James F . . . , manager. Mr. F . . . . is the one who telephoned me the order this morning.
>
> For your own convenience only, I have reason to believe this material is for the Chevrolet Motor Company, but they do not want it advertised or generally known that they are the buyers. (Exhibit 233.)

The following is also a typical order for the purchase of ammunition:[12]

> Dear D . . . . On May 28, 1934, we shipped to L. J. B. . . . the following material:
>
> 7 long range gun outfits.
> 36 K. O. and tear gas candles.
> 50 straight tear gas candles.
> 55 red band hand grenades.
> 7 gas masks for use against CN-DM.
> 96 fast tear gas candles.
> 24 red band hand grenades.
>
> This billing amounted to $3,588.56.
>
> On June 22, 50 K. O. and tear gas candles were shipped to the same party.
>
> We are certain this material was for Anaconda Copper company, although Mr. B . . . . did not disclose that to us, and you will have to handle the material diplomatically in order to explain how you happen to know about it . . . . (Exhibit 231.)

From this evidence it should be clear enough that the truly nonresistant Christian can have no part in the struggle for economic power, either on the side of the class conscious workers or on that of their industrial overlords. But as said before, the Mennonite Church is face to face with this problem, and it cannot be evaded. It is necessary to do something about it. What shall this something

11. Quoted from the LaFollette committee's reports in *Ibid.*, p. 528.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 528.

be? The author of this paper does not pretend to have found a solution for the problem at hand. But he would like to submit for the consideration of this meeting, three ideas which have suggested themselves to him.

The first idea comes from the agreement which was formed in November, 1935, by representatives of the Mennonite church with the United Mine Workers of America regarding the relation to this union of members of the church who are coal miners in the Pittsburgh-Johnstown area. By this arrangement the miners' union permits members of the church to work in the mines without membership in the union. It is understood that these Mennonite coal miners shall sign no papers nor participate in any union activities. Neither shall they resist any union activities "but passively refrain from work around the mines in times of strikes or lockouts and make no demands relative to grievances or otherwise." The weak point in the arrangement seems to be the provision for a check-off from the wages of these non-union men each pay day "equivalent to the dues and other charges collected from members of the union."[13] This money goes into the treasury of the union, of course, and makes its contribution to the struggle for power. It is not a very good use for nonresistant money. Of course we are all aware that Mennonite money paid as taxes to the federal government is used for military purposes and perhaps this is not a good use for nonresistant money either. But these two cases are not quite analogous. After all, taxes in themselves are legitimate and Scriptural. They belong to the government and are used for a variety of legitimate purposes. The government may use some of its income for military purposes, of course. But when it does so it is the government's responsibility and not that of the tax payer. The case of the union check-off, however, is hardly the same. The union exists for one purpose and one alone—to carry on the fight for economic power. And when nonresistant money goes into the union treasury it is used for a purpose which is altogether out of harmony with the nonresistant way of life. In many ways the check-off seems similar to non-combatant service in the army in time of war. In the former case the miner contributes his money so John Lewis can carry on his fight against the industrial enemy. In the latter case the non-com-

13. *A Statement of the Position of the Mennonite Church on Unionism.* (Four page leaflet, Scottdale, Pa.)

batant soldier cooks the meals or services the airplanes for the soldiers so they can carry on their fight with the national enemy. These remarks are not intended as a criticism of the agreement made in November, 1935. They simply represent an attempt to face the problem realistically. And it does seem that there is a weak point in the agreement. The author cheerfully admits the difficulties of the situation, however, and no doubt the agreement was the best which could be obtained under the circumstances. His only further suggestion on this point would be a word of caution against a complacent feeling that this problem has been settled and that no further thought need be given the matter.[14]

The second idea which the author should like to submit is with special reference to the industrial employer. We have a number of industrial employers in the Mennonite church. I trust we have no industrial overlords. But we do have the employers. And it seems to me that these employers of industrial labor have an opportunity and a responsibility to give a clear witness for the nonresistant faith such as few of us have. Mennonites have long taken pride in their ideal agricultural communities. Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Wayne County, Ohio, Woodford County, Illinois, and Johnson County, Iowa, consider themselves the garden spots of America. It is 175 years since Crevecoeur wrote of the happiness and contentment of the American farmer. But most Mennonites believe, and I think rightly so, that what was true of Crevecoeur's America in the eighteenth century is still true to a large extent in the average Mennonite rural community today. If this view is correct then there is something about the Mennonite faith or way of life which has helped to keep it so. And if this is true, then the Mennonite way of life has something to contribute to industrial communities also. It is my personal opinion, however, that these Mennonite industries dare not become too large. If they do, they will be in danger of becoming impersonal, soulless corporations. They must remain small enough for the preservation of wholesome personal relations between employer and employee. And Mennonite employers dare not delay the introduction of progressive measures for the improvement of working and living conditions and the development of

14. Since the presentation of this paper the writer has been informed that in at least one other instance Mennonites have made a similar agreement with union officials, but with the check-off eliminated. There may be other cases where this has been done.

wholesome employer-employee relationships until compelled to do so by some outside force.

Mennonite factories should be the happiest, the most contented industrial units in America, where employer and employees labor together in conscious co-operation and where the class struggle has no opportunity of taking root because employer and employee belong to one and the same class and will have it no other way. In the course of their history the Mennonite farmers of Europe and America have frequently been visited by agricultural experts interested in studying their methods. I should like to hear it said today that sociologists, economists, and experts in the field of industrial relations pay frequent visits to Mennonite industrial plants to learn the secret of their success in maintaining wholesome relations without any sign of a struggle for power. If this should occur it is not altogether clear in my own mind what their findings should consist of, entirely. But I should expect to hear of a yearly wage, providing some security against seasonal and periodic lay-offs. I should expect to hear of an adjustable wage scale based on a bonus system. And of a regular division of profits on a percentage basis by which a percentage of the profits, which the employee understands from the beginning of his service, goes to management, another percentage to the stock holders, and another percentage to labor. And I should expect to hear of other similar devices. But above all I should expect the visiting expert in the Mennonite factory to learn of the Christian faith and the nonresistant way of life which prevails there causing the employer to seek the highest welfare of his employees for the employees' sake, and causing the employees to seek the welfare of their employer for the employer's sake.

And now the third idea. Personally, I think Thomas Jefferson was right when he stressed rural life and the farm as essential for healthy social living. Crevecoeur too was right when he contrasted the happiness and contentment of the free American farmer with the misery of the European peasant or laborer who had no opportunity in life because of his subservience to his overlord. Here in America the Mennonite people have always been farmers. And they have been free. They have worked hard, and they have not been rich. But neither have they been the victims of oppression. Our Mennonite people have lived on the farm. And I think they should continue to do so. Their nonresistant faith with its co-opera-

tive way of life has a better opportunity to express itself there than anywhere else, and I feel that they should cling to this opportunity. In large scale industry the struggle for power is bound to continue. Surely this is not the proper place for the nonresistant Mennonites. Let them remain in their small rural communities where their warm religious faith can have an opportunity to bind them together into closely knit, intimate community relationships.

But if this ideal is to be realized, and if increasing numbers of Mennonite families are not to be drained into the industrial life of our larger cities there must be some careful, co-operative planning. Many of our people are leaving the farm because they find it difficult to remain there. It is not as easy for a young married couple to begin farming as it once was. Fathers do not have as many extra farms to hand out to their children as they had at one time. Rents, purchase prices, and interest rates are high. Banks are interested first in protecting their depositors and only secondly in helping the young couple to get started. And probably not at all in building a nonresistant Mennonite community. Furthermore, in recent years the farmer has found it difficult enough to keep his ledger out of the red. And so some of our people have taken what seemed the easiest way out. They have turned to the city for a job, and sometimes in a factory where they have become involved in the industrial conflict.

What kind of co-operative planning will be needed for the realization and maintenance of this ideal Christian rural community life of which I speak? Or to revert to an earlier suggestion, if the rural sociologists and the experts in rural community planning should study our ideal Mennonite community to learn the secret of its success, what would they find? Again it is not altogether clear in my own mind what their findings should consist of, entirely. But I should expect them to discover a number of things. For instance, I should expect them to find a well organized system of mutual aid. This community should have its own social security program, well organized and carefully financed. In case of sickness or death in any family this system should function so as not to leave any destitution. For only so can life insurance and the need for government social security be obviated in our Mennonite communities. There should be a carefully managed financial organization to assist young people in getting a start farming for themselves. Brethren with money to spare, instead of investing it in industrial stocks and

bonds, where it is likely to be used in the industrial conflict, should place it in the custody of this organization which would use it to assist those in need of assistance. Every Mennonite community should own some land for the use of its needy members. If there is insufficient land available in a given community to meet the needs of its young people, lands should be purchased by common endeavor somewhere else, perhaps in areas largely depopulated through the removal of its people to the cities, and a new community and congregation founded.

The Mennonite Central Committee owns 300,000 acres of land in Paraguay, purchased with money loaned by the American Mennonites for the aid of their refugee brethren from Russia. Is it not just as reasonable that a Mennonite organization should purchase land at home, with money loaned by the brotherhood, for the aid of their refugee brethren who are about to flee to the city, or who would like to flee from the city, or who ought to do so? Endowment funds of Mennonite missions and colleges ought to be used to help keep Mennonites on the farm. This should attach the missions and colleges to the rural communities, and the rural communities to the missions and colleges. There should be such a strong church-community spirit that graduates of the colleges will want to go back to the rural community and give their life of service there. If they are farmers themselves they would give their service as farmers. If teachers, by teaching in the rural community schools. And if doctors, they should serve as country doctors in the rural community. In some cases small Mennonite community hospitals might well be erected and these together with the entire medical service of the community managed and financed on a co-operative basis, giving equal medical services for all. But most important of all, this ideal community must be permeated by the spirit of Christ. The nonresistant way of life must direct its every work and motive. And then in such a community, so conceived and so dedicated and so managed, there ought to be a happiness and a contentment and a security so great as to prevent any appreciable drift of our Mennonite population to the large urban centers of industrial conflict.